

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. XIII.

July, 1916

No. 3.

SHAKESPEARE'S VALUE TO THE MINISTER OF TODAY.

BY FREDERICK W. EBERHARDT, D.D., DANVILLE, KY.

The three hundredth anniversary of the death of William Shakespeare has called forth a universal revival of interest in the personality and writings of the world's greatest poet.

By slow degrees, and not without opposition, he has climbed the heights of Parnassus, where now his throne is established above those of any of the glorious company of the Immortals.

This supremacy is not due to perfection of attainment in any or in all the standards of literary art. The noble three of Ancient Greece surpassed him in the perfection of dramatic form; Dante soared far beyond him in the realm of imagination; Goethe and Browning were greater masters in the sphere of philosophy; Ibsen and Balzac gave a more realistic representation of the social problems of their age. But Shakespeare combined all these elements more completely and in addition revealed more perfectly the souls of real men and women and the beautiful world—God-made and man-made—in which they lived and moved and had their being. He delineates the reality of humanity, but sets down nought in malice. Man's passion and pride; his fraud and deceit; his nobility and baseness; his achievement and failure, are interpreted in

the spirit of the true optimist. Like the prophets of The Book, he sees clearly the curse of the race, but ever beyond and above, the eternal purpose of the redeeming God towards His fallen but not hopeless spiritual creatures—that their destiny is good.

The world is full of infinite human variety. The poet's boundless laughter and tears; the smiles and the sighs; the hopes and despair; the triumph and defeat, are expressed with equal felicity, whether in comedy, tragedy, romance, drama or sonnet.

Whether, therefore, it be for evil or for good, Shakespeare has a message of ever increasing importance that is being read in all the languages of earth. The man appointed to be the teacher and admonisher of the people—to guide them in the ways of moral and spiritual truth, cannot ignore that message. To know that message is an imperative element, therefore, of the minister's equipment for efficient service next to knowledge of the Bible and the literature that has grown up around it. The dramas of this prince of human interpreters should become the familiar acquaintance of the preacher's study.

READING SHAKESPEARE FOR PLEASURE.

The Twentieth Century minister is a busy man. He must be a student first of all. He must know books as well as men. Morning, noon and night he must be alert in his search for homiletical material. It is little wonder, therefore, that eventually he ceases to give his mind and heart a chance to find delight in the world of nature and of art. Now poetry, like music and painting, is an art intended primarily to give pleasure. It is time well-spent just to read Shakespeare for the pure pleasure of reading. Thus the poems and dramas should be read from beginning to end without regard to study of any kind. All attempt to consider them as a source of illustration or a means of culture may be ignored. Let the poet speak as friend

speaks to friend. Let him have his chance. This is the only way to enjoy truth and beauty without prejudice. Alas, that the age has become so scholastic that even the book of books is rarely ever read in this way by its interpreters!

And what a world of delightful experiences is to be found in this master musician of the glorious English language! How marvelous is the melody of his verse, from the lilting rhyme and rippling rythm of "A Mid-Summer Night's Dream" to the sonorous organ tones of Hamlet and Othello! What beautiful imagery in simile and metaphor! How the felicitous expressions of wit delight, and the profound pathos of suffering move the heart to pity! How the bugle call of conflict rouses the soul to desire a share in all the high challenge of heroic endeavor! Then, too, Shakespeare's world of men and women is so well worth knowing. To be introduced into the society of such delightful wits as Petruchio, Benedict, Faulconbridge, Mercutio, Beatrice and Rosalind is to share a higher privilege than that offered by the Parisian salons at their best. The broader humor of Bottom, Sly, Touchstone, Autolycus, Falstaff, Maria and the Merry Wives will do much to drive away the melancholy of many a discouraged hour, while to be merely a door-keeper of the hall where walk such noble creatures as Hamlet, Othello, Henry V, Antonio, Portia, Hermione and Imogen is to be indeed one of fortune's favorites.

STUDYING SHAKESPEARE FOR SELF-CULTURE.

The minister must be a man of culture in order to become a fruitful preacher. As soils are enriched and made productive by the introduction of certain outside elements before they become capable of yielding large returns from the implanted seed, so the preacher's efficiency is enhanced by the processes of intellectual culture due to the assimilation of the finer thoughts of the masters of the

representative arts. These can never take the place of that divinely "implanted word which is able to save men's souls"; they do aid, however, in making the heavenly seed more fruitful, else why read books at all, or set up schools?

The study of Shakespeare from the stage is of doubtful value. There the story of the play is unduly prominent. With the single exception of "The Merry Wives of Windsor" he invented no plots. He was the prince of borrowers, but by an amazing alchemy he transformed the baser metal of the original story into the pure gold of wisdom and beauty. Then, too, the personality and art of the actor overshadows the real charm of the poet's genius. One goes away from a performance of Hamlet or Othello saying what a great actor is Booth or Salvini and not what a great poet is Shakespeare.

First as a means of culture is the study of the schools—that of investigation, analysis, comparison, etc.—which has to do with grammatical and rhetorical laws, sources, versification, imagery, description and dramatic structure. This is difficult and for the best results requires a trained instructor. Nevertheless, much can be accomplished with only a judicious use of good books as guides and the help obtainable by means of study clubs like the Shakespeare Seven of the Seminary, to which the writer owes an inexpressible debt of gratitude. In the very beginning of such a study one must beware of that cheap criticism of the mechanical school of poetry that condemns Shakespeare's dramatic art for lack of conformity to certain arbitrary laws of form. There are defects to be sure. Not one of the plays was edited or published by him, many of the earlier and a few of the later were not altogether his own work, but apart from this fact he was a law unto himself. He created his own standards. As Ibsen said of Peer Gynt, only more justly, could he say of *The Tempest*, "If it is not poetry by the rule of the pedant then it will be by a higher rule because I make it so."

Matter is always more to him than form; a living clown than a marble god. It is folly to shut one's eyes to the lovely gardens of fragrant flowers; the cool, deep forests; the fair cities glowing with the pageantry of the eternally human, because, forsooth, the magic mirror through which the august magician bids us gaze is not framed in exact accord with some fictitious standard of proportion.

Another method of study as a means of culture deals with the growth of the poet's mind and art. This concerns itself with such historical and biographical material as can be found by internal and external evidence. It used to be said that Shakespeare's personality was so lost in his writings that all effort to find the author in his works was unavailing. This is far from true, however. Under the guidance of such writers as Sidney Lee, Dowden, Swinburne and others, much will be found of great interest concerning his family, birthplace, education, early marriage, life in London, return to Stratford, etc., beside the wealth of historical information relating to the glorious world of literature, science, discovery and chivalry of which he was so potently a part, and how these all influenced the development of his character and the progress and expansion of his art. Of course there is danger of going to the opposite extreme and of finding more than is really there. It seems quite clear, however, that the productive cycle of his writings can be divided into three distinct periods each marked by clearly defined characteristics, and the entire cycle demonstrating the fact that the greatest literary genius of our race achieved greatness only through patient toil and heroic wrestlings against the inner and outer forces of evil.

The first period begins in 1591, with *Love's Labor Lost* and closes with *Twelfth Night* in 1600. Twenty-two plays were produced during these nine years. Five years before, Shakespeare, then, a youth unknown to fortune and to fame, had entered London. Those were the days when knighthood was in full flower and the Court of

Elizabeth was the center not only of all that was noble in arms, but also of the more enduring arts of culture and progress. There was hard work to be done by the young lad from the country—menial service at first, and afterward the hack-work of a beginner in dramatic art. What matter, he was young and patient and brave; there was a wife and child back home; the song of beauty and achievement was ever singing in his soul and bubbling from his lips, for life to him was one long, beautiful springtime of joy and gladness and laughter. All this is reflected in the delightful comedies of the time.

The middle period is that of the great tragedies. It begins with Julius Caesar in 1601 and ends with Coriolanus in 1609, and includes, besides these two, Hamlet, Troillus and Cressida, Othello, Macbeth, Lear, Timon of Athens, Pericles, Measure for Measure and the Sonnets.

The poet has now reached the maturity of life and genius. He has mastered his art but not himself. He has become famous and prosperous financially. He has made many friends, but something sinister seems to have come upon him. He dwells in the thick darkness of lurid storm clouds. He grapples with the ugly passions of envy, jealousy, hatred and greed. The strong men and lovely women about him harbor treachery and lust of the basest sort. His passion-swept soul is almost overwhelmed by resentment and despair. He does not yield to discouragement, however. He seeks no juniper bush, but meets the wilderness tempter and at last conquers doubt and despair by hard work and loyal faith. Some inner force holds him true amid the tumult of doubt. Again and again he strikes the harp of his genius with mighty crash sending forth those terrible chords of passion which today still vibrate in the hearts of men.

Then comes the closing period of Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale, The Tempest and Henry VIII. Now his soul is serene, but stronger because of the experience of affliction. He has conquered himself and is in harmony

with himself, with man and with God. He leaves the glitter of courts, the clash of camps, the sordid ambitions of cities, and from the sweet content of a reunited family in Stratford, he gives the world his final message of wisdom. I verily believe that in the three noble romance dramas that close his poetic career, we have the most precious trilogy of Faith, Home and Love the old world will ever find outside the Bible.

Such a study is rich in human interest and offers opportunities for the noblest self-culture.

THE ETHICAL VALUE OF SHAKESPEARE.

The minister will find in the dramas of Shakespeare a wealth of ethical teaching. The poet is a great moral teacher. He never sermonizes save now and then in jest. Perhaps he never deliberately purposes to present a moral truth but the very fact that he is unconscious of any such purpose adds value to the result. It is remarkable that in an age of license dangerously near to licentiousness, a writer, himself so susceptible to environment and who covers the whole field of social life; who borrows so largely from French and Italian literature dominated by men like Montaigne and Boccaccio, should give the world a message that needs so little expurgation. It must be admitted that his characters discourse too freely at times of those things polite society now does not introduce into public conversation. That was an Elizabethan failing. Gather up under one moral head all he has written, however, and it will readily appear that vice is never condoned, evil never triumphs ultimately and virtue, kindness, mercy, goodness, industry, justice, prudence, temperance, etc., are always held in honor and made commendable. ...

One would not expect to find the ethical purpose conspicuous in the comedies, especially those of the earlier years. At that time Shakespeare was concerned with the

mere joy of living, which he expresses in every phase of mirth and gladness. The comedies, however, do serve the cause of virtue by exposing and holding up to ridicule the follies of men and women as well as their vices. While he laughs at these with good natured raillery, he also gives the lash. Like a wise-hearted, smiling-eyed showman, he calls up a whole troop of jolly, happy-hearted people, showing how lovable they are and yet how many faults and follies they possess. While we laugh with him, we are presently aware that we are looking at ourselves in his magic mirror and resolve to amend our faults. It is good, wholesome treatment to have an ass's head set upon conceited ignorance; to outtrail a shrewish tongue, to laugh forced melancholy out of court; to make lechery and drunkenness breathe the foulness of dirty linen, feel the blows of the irate husband, the pinch and fire of innocence, and land at last in the filthy ditch that represents its own nastiness. It is the wisdom of Shakespeare, however, not merely to punish, but to reform. While we exclaim, "What fools these mortals be!" we are not made pessimists, but are left to hope that all will end well; therefore, all is well.

The tragedies are powerful homilies on the moral code embodied in the second table of the law. They present individual problems but are all developed along lines common to each. Here is seen the inevitable, ever present conflict between good and evil that marks Jacob's road to Bethel, Joseph's to the throne, David's path through the wilderness, Elijah's vision of the earthquake and fire, Job's titantic wrestlings and which reddened the Master's pathway through the mount of temptation and Gethsemane with the blood drops of His divine agony until at last was wrought the eternal tragedy of Golgotha.

With Shakespeare the struggle is not in the realm of romance as in the stories of Siegfried and Arthur. It is our own struggle in the sphere of everyday life he represents. It is real to the men and women who daily wait

upon our ministry. The greater the character the greater the conflict. The assaults of evil are never felt in full power by weaklings. Cleopatra, Lady Macbeth, Iago, Goneril and Regan represent tempters too great to bring about a tragedy in lesser men than Anthony, Macbeth, Othello or Lear.

In Shakespeare's tragedies the downfall of a great soul is a sacrifice that vindicates the cause of truth, and establishes some abiding principle of righteousness—becoming almost vicarious in its sufferings. In Lear and Othello love triumphs over slander and hypocrisy. Cordelia and Desdemona are vindicated before the tribunal that had judged them as unworthy. The lofty idealism of Hamlet prevails in death over the sordid materialism of the Danish Court. The task he was unable to perform in life he accomplishes in death—bequeathing to the man of deeds the care of a nation he himself was incapable of ruling. Along these lines the other tragedies also illustrate the principle inwrought in the eternal purposes of God through the ages—that evil can never ultimately triumph over good.

Another great ethical law is exemplified in the tragedies. Satan finds something in fallen man he can claim as his own to which he appeals and thereby gains entrance into the human heart. This is the fearful secret of the tragic havoc wrought by sin. In the tragedies the catastrophe is inevitable through an inherent weakness to which the tempter appeals. This is the supreme agony of the fall, hence these dramas furnish thrilling illustrations of the preacher's most vital message. Only one could ever say "the prince of this world cometh; and he hath nothing in me."

Lear is the tragedy of the will. The will to rule his people as a kingly father is made helpless through the inherent passion of self-indulgence and vanity of self-love to which in the person of his vile daughters the tempter makes his appeal.

Macbeth is the tragedy of Ambition, and illustrates the career of Saul, Israel's first king. Unlike the conscienceless Richard, Macbeth can hear the voice of conscience, but ambition, self-centered offers the key to the tempter in the person of Lady Macbeth.

Hamlet is the tragedy of the intellect. He is not a dreamer but a rationalist. The facts of life call for men of deeds. The need for action is plain to the prince of Denmark, but the student of metaphysics fresh from the speculative atmosphere of Wittenberg must first analyze, weigh and compare duties and in the meantime the evil doers have their way.

Othello is the world's great tragedy of love. The Moor of Venice and not Romeo is Shakespeare's true lover. There is less of inherent weakness in his character than in any other of Shakespeare's men and it takes the most terrible artist in temptation to accomplish his overthrow. Yet he falls through an exaggerated sense of personal honor to which the seducer appeals.

Still another great ethical principle is embodied in the tragedies, namely, that the catastrophe which is potential through inherent weakness becomes dynamic through the submission of the masculine energy of initiative to the feminine law of receptivity. When the oak tries to bend itself to the will of the vine that embraces it, both are shattered. The reverse of this law is just as true though Shakespeare does not deal with that side of the subject except incidentally. His heroines are either strong to save their men by influencing them to firmness in the path of duty or else they destroy them by misdirecting them from that path. Coriolanus yields the conqueror's right to the soft appeals of a mother, though he knows it means his doom. Anthony flings away victory to follow the silken sails of the siren Cleopatra. Macbeth stifles the voice of conscience in deference to the will of his wife. Lear stoops his kingly head to the poisonous flattery of his serpent daughters. Othello is ensnared in

the net of Iago's villainy—and Iago represents a type of wickedness that is essentially feminine. In *Hamlet*, the most subtle of all dramas, the two natures are present in one person and are at war. The king by inheritance and the soldier by training are at war with the male intuitions that are feminine in quality, and the noblest mind in all literature is shattered. How these tragedies illustrate the great themes of the Bible! Adam, the man, yields himself to the will of Eve, the woman, and Eden is lost and ever since, when Samson dallies in the lap of Delilah; when Jezebel sways the scepter of Ahab, heroes are changed to blinded slaves and kingdoms become the habitations of tyranny and corruption. In nothing is the integrity of Job more apparent than in his refusal to yield to the demands of the unworthy woman by his side.

Two other principles are obviously manifest in the tragedies and need no amplification—one, that the harvest of evil is always greater than the sowing; the other, that the most terrible consequence of tragic evil falls upon the innocent. It is the Cordelias and Desdemonas who feel the most fearful pangs of suffering, not the Othellos and Lears.

The strongest ethical message of Shakespeare to my mind is found in the plays of the last period. *Cymbeline*, *Winter's Tale*, *Tempest* and *Henry VIII*. Here the moral problems are lifted into the realm of the spiritual. The poet's genius rings true to life's highest ideals. The subject is too large for detailed discussion here, but let a man read these plays carefully, with a view to finding their moral significance and he will find them illustrating many of the great doctrines of the Word of God. "The Divinity that shapes our ends" directs our own way as well. Affliction is only the threshing flail that separates the chaff from the wheat. Imogen and Hermione are lovelier than Portia and Rosalind because they have been purified in the furnace of trial.

The nobility of forgiveness and reconciliation is displayed in the characters of Imogen, Hermione and Prospero. Not palliation, however, but forgiveness, for wrongs that have been shown to be culpable is granted only after true repentance has been displayed.

The dignity of labor and its value in discipline are set forth. Imogen's brothers under the guidance of their wise tutor are taught to earn their daily bread in the sweat of their faces. Perdita is reared in the sweet simplicity of the shepherd's life. Miranda, the unspoiled daughter of Nature, is reared with the sense of being a real helpmeet and instead of wanting her lover cut up into stars, she craves the privilege of sharing with him the heavy task which is to test his manhood.

The problem of good and evil may be worked out here in this life. One need not die like Othello to vindicate true love. It is better to live and suffer in order to learn like Posthumus and Leontes, that love never faileth. If the world is out of joint it is better, like Prospero, to grapple with its lameness and attempt to set it right than, like Hamlet, to bemoan the task. Then the wickedness of an Iago will be seen in its essential nature and like Caliban be bound in slavery to one, who having mastered self, becomes himself a law of providence to those who are weak. Then at last it will appear that "God's in His heaven and all's right with the world" and that the future is radiant with the rainbow of promise for "the best is yet to be."

“HE SHALL NOT SPEAK FROM HIMSELF;”

A NOTE UPON THE METHOD AND MATTER AND END OF
DIVINE REVELATION.

A. D. MARTIN, AUGUSTINE CHURCH, EDINBURGH.

4 SOUTH GRAY ST., EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

“The Spirit of Truth,” said our Lord, “shall not speak from himself.”—John 16:13. That is a very startling statement. For the Spirit of Truth is of all spirits the one we should most expect would speak from Himself. There could be no error in the Spirit of Truth speaking from Himself. And on the side of the recipient, is there a nobler passion than the longing to know the Truth without admixture or veil? Yet, as the context to this saying plainly shows, the value of teaching does not turn only upon the measure of Truth unfolded. Otherwise there would be no reason for our Lord to affirm as He does, first of all, “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye are not able to carry (βαρῦν ἑταίρῳ) them now.” (John 16:12.) The value of any teaching depends not only upon the truth expressed, but also upon the fitness of that truth to some particular stage of human need. We sometimes withhold truth from our children for their good. And we can understand, therefore, that in our own case the Spirit of Truth must not speak simply from Himself.*

“What things soever he shall hear these shall he speak.” When we ask, From whom does He hear? the commentators generally reply, From the Father. And we may take it so; only we have to guard against any crude notions of intercourse within the Godhead, as intercourse may be amongst ourselves, or even as a man may

*ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ is classified by Thayer-Grimm as “from his own disposition, as distinguished from another’s instruction.”

be said to commune with his own mind. No doubt the saying is profound. It is not, however, beyond interpretation. We shall grasp something of its meaning if we remember that the New Testament conception of the Divine Economy associates the activity of the Father with the sphere we call "Providence." It is in His directing and overruling of human life that the Father operates. And, therefore, it is in the social order and in history that the Spirit listening knows what truth to teach. That is to say, the Spirit teaches along the lines already laid down by the Father in the controlled circumstances of human existence, and in all that education which events and social environment convey.

This is doctrine which is certainly liable to misuse. It might easily be made the defense of a barren conventionalism. That it has, however, a nobler significance is shown by experience, and notably by the experience of our Lord. For something of this speaking of the Spirit as not from Himself can be seen even in His case. The teaching of Jesus was chiefly impressive as being derived, in an original way, from the Scripture of His people. It was a teaching which we may describe in phrases borrowed from the letter of Ignatius to the Romans (though applied by him to them)—"being filled with the grace of God without wavering, and filtered clear from every foreign stain." "Filled and filtered," or, if we may reverse the order, "filtered and filled," the religious mind of Israel was, through Jesus, brought to its final efficiency. His authority was seen in His rejection of things unworthy as well as in His perfecting of things that were good. And His authority was the authority of the Hebrew Inspiration. All the truth of its mind crystallized in Him. We observe that even the great moments of the Baptism and the Transfiguration are recorded in Old Testament terms; the very voices that spoke from Heaven combined phrases from the accepted Messianic Scriptures. And thus the expressed and standardized experi-

ence of an elect people had for Christ an objective value, with which no glory of individual feeling could afford to dispense. So the Spirit of Truth appears to have spoken even in Jesus not from Himself, but to have operated with established experience, doubtless bestowing an increment therewith, yet ever retaining the divine force of past events.

Now if the action of the Revealing Spirit in our Lord's mortal life was after this manner, how much more certainly must we expect the same method of activity in our own imperfect nature. For perils, which had no place in His life of entire self-abnegation, easily attach themselves to our thinking. Such perils, one means, as this of which Milton speaks in the *Areopagitica*, “When the new light which we beg for shines in upon us, there be who envy and oppose if it come not first in at their casements.” We are tempted to claim a patent for our seeming discoveries in the world of Truth. And, again, experience shows us that we need a guard against everything savoring of spiritual Quixoties—Truth seen in a disproportioned perspective. And yet again, we need to be saved from the evil which ever besets the visionary and mystic, the peril of denying the value and reality of the past. Finally, this means that we need something to preserve for us the continuity and collectivity of the divine life in men. It has been said—and the words are at least true of what should be the case—“our inner life consists in working out and realizing the value of our relationships to the actual world, and, above all, of our relationships to other men and to that historical course of events to which our own existence is due.”* This it is which the Spirit of Truth, speaking the things He has heard from the Father, is able to effect in us, thereby lifting our true life above all jeopardy and giving it a place for nurture and expansion in the divine organism, the Christian society.

*Hermann “The Communion of the Church with God.” Eng. translation, p. 218.

II.

If, however, what we have so far seen, exhausted the Spirit's functions there would be at least a danger of Christian experience being shut up within a circle, instead of moving upon a spiral towards a higher world. But the interpretation of that Present, which is the conserved Past, is only part of the Spirit's work. After the words we have considered it is added, "And he shall declare unto you the things which are to come." If the Spirit of Truth, speaking things He has heard, interprets things already said and done, He also takes of things which as yet are not, "things to come," and declares them unto us.

It is important to notice that even in this unveiling of future things the law holds good, "He shall not speak from himself." For there can be no question but that this is the governing thought of the entire passage before us, seeing it is spoken with reference to the Spirit's guidance of us into "all the truth." The things to come of which He speaks are things of Christ, not a world of abstractions. It is the Saviour of mankind whom the Spirit expounds, though Christ most widely considered, Christ who, in the noble phrase of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 9:11), is "a high priest of the good things to come"—the conveyancer of the truth of our golden optimisms—Christ who Himself declares, "All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore, said I that he taketh of mine and shall declare it unto you."

It may be that for those to whom the promise of the spirit as thus commissioned first came the words had an eschatological meaning. "Things to come" may have suggested to them dramatic events, cataclysmic deliverances and a Last Judgment. But it will be at least lawful for us to interpret the promise in the line of our Lord's parable of the leaven and find the words hold good

in our own experience of the Divine Teacher.* Then the nature of the Christ-things to come will be such as finds embodiment in the transformation of human life and character under the preaching of His gospel. And then we shall find essential inspiration in such ideas as are expressed in the poem of Mr. J. A. Symonds beginning thus:

"These things shall be! a loftier race
Than e'er the world has known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls
And light of knowledge in their eyes."

And yet closer to the showing of the Spirit will be the famous canto from "In Memoriam,"

"Ring out wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying cloud, the frosty light:
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out wild bells, and let him die.

* * * * *

Ring out old shapes of foul disease;
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be."

Yes, he who takes of the things of Christ to show them to us, shows them not only as things rooted in the Past, but also as things to come—"the Christ that is to be."

There is thus in this work of the Spirit of Truth a gathering up of the treasures of the Past, and also a

*If we take the view of the purpose of the sayings respecting the Paraclete set forth in Prof. Ernest Scott's *The Fourth Gospel*, this will be the only interpretation possible. Vide op. cit. chs. 10 and 11.

reaching out towards the riches of the Future, and in all His teaching what we have is a definite and unfolding interpretation of the phenomena of Jesus.

III.

Now, when we put the two sides of this Johannine saying together—the interpretation of things “heard” and the interpretation of things “to come,”—we obtain results for Faith of the highest value to Christian Unity—Unity considered not simply as conserved with existing ecclesiastical arrangements, but Unity of a more comprehensive, and of a deeper kind, binding us to the whole Catholic Church, Past and Present, and associating us “with all the company of Heaven.” This Unity will be seen in our relation to Christ under the two aspects of the Truth and the Life.

1. *Our Relation to Christ as the Truth.* The real creeds of the Past will become, as fragmentary expressions of the mind of the Spirit, unspeakably precious to us. We shall need to take all their vitality and value with us. No one age of the Church has been able to attain to all the Truth, but every age has had its own gift of God. The time-spirit is no more than an underagent of the Holy Spirit, yet in the church it may be at least as much as this. Every generation of Christian men has had its own distinctive vision of the Son of God.

But, on the other hand, just because the Spirit’s revelation is concerned with a Divine Christ, it has been impossible for men to receive it under any true aspect without knowing something of Christ in His completeness. There is seen to be a congruity of Truth, a unity in the parts of Revelation. The whole is in the part as well as the part in the whole. Physical analogies to this abound and will occur readily to every student of God’s works in nature. With reference to some of these M. Bergson has said, “The elements of a tendency are not like objects set beside each other in space and mutually exclusive, but

rather like psychic states, each of which although it be itself to begin with, yet partakes of others, and so virtually includes in itself the whole personality to which it belongs. There is no real manifestation of life that does not show us, in a rudimentary or latent state the character of other manifestations"* So also is it in Christ. The gospel, like the seamless robe, is of the piece throughout. It sums up the value of the manifold revelation contained in the Old Testament. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." (Rev. 19:10.) It reveals a unity of mind and purpose in the Redeemer's mortal life. Given the fact of the Person of Christ as we see Him in Galilee, and, under the Spirit's quickening, we look for Calvary and the Resurrection and Pentecost. Given the ethic of the Sermon on the Mount and a will in absolute loyalty to that ethic, and we understand the Atonement as psychological necessity. Given the Passion and we can foreshadow these things to be the Reconciliation of men in the social order and in the Eternal Life.

One practical deduction follows from this working of the Spirit. Amid the unrest and change of thought in the world, this will be clear to us—God does not speak today what He will contradict tomorrow. When we are bidden by those who stand uncommitted to any creed, to preserve an open mind upon all the problems of life, we shall agree only postulating that our open mind be not like a door that is open to the street, ready to admit any drifting rubbish that may litter the public way. One has, indeed, met with some open minds like such an open door. But the mind of Jesus, as we have seen, was not miscellaneous; and the Christian open mind must be an active mind, knowing itself and its own history, not forgetting the cleansing from old sins, building up all its "new thought" in harmony with its earliest convictions. As the elder wrote (2 Ep. John 9), "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not

*Creative Evolution, pp. 124, 5.

God." It is possible to go onward and yet to abide. It is possible because Truth is one. Nor could anything be much further from fact than the Pagan notion lately revived, of a Reality "beyond Good or Evil." It is one God who is both transcendent and immanent. In every trace of Him we see His fullness shadowed forth. So the fact that we do not know all creates no misgiving. We hold the germ of future creeds. No truth can dawn which is not of Christ. The Spirit is one. The Truth is one. "All things that the Father hath are mine." It is He whom our hearts already know, who is the "high priest of the good things to come." The steadying power of this fact in days of controversy is of incalculable benefit. It is the peace of God which passeth beyond all the labors of our understanding, enduing us with the essential values of Reason, while as yet Reason still toils behind at her long-sustained task.

2. *Our Relations to Christ as the Life.* In the peace of God thus established within the soul lies the promise of Unity in the Church. From all faith-contact with Reality there flows a social consequence. This must needs be because God is not only the God of the one but also the God of the many. The closer the contact is the wider will be the resultant sympathies. So in the higher and more intimate apprehensions of the religious life, springing from obedience to Christ as the Truth, there lies an experience which proves itself as fundamentally common to all Christ's people in every age. And thus there is opened up a way of double gain. With two hands does the individual man lay hold upon eternal life, one in his beseeching touch upon the robe of the Revealing Spirit, whereby he has his own incommunicable gift of God, his "new name which no man knoweth but he that receiveth it" (Rev. 2:17); one in the fellowship he establishes with all who have already found God. By these two apprehensions the revelation of the manifold wisdom of God grows from more to more, till the congruity of the Truth

is unveiled in a community of life. It is with the second of these two means of increase we are now concerned.

At one point in the Eleventh Book of *The Prelude*, Wordsworth addressed himself to Coleridge in lines which serve to illustrate our theme. Coleridge was at that time visiting Syracuse, and Wordsworth was led by that fact to recall the splendid story of Timoleon, one of the few Greeks of the 4th century B. C. who made their politics a passion for the popular good. With such a history cleaving to their chief town, it seemed to Wordsworth the Sicilians of his own day should have been foremost in the struggle for the great ideals of the French Revolution, but how had they failed! What could the poet say to cheer his friend in face of such a sorrowful spectacle? Mere lamentation was of no avail, yet there was one high, bracing thought:

"But indignation works where hope is not,
And thou, O Friend! wilt be refreshed. There is
One great society alone on earth:
The noble living and the noble dead."

Such a conception is indeed refreshment in the days of reaction. Timoleon and Coleridge can join hands across the centuries. One ideal of civil righteousness belongs to both. Perhaps not simply under a figure but in actuality the two may meet.

In like manner as pupils of a common teacher, and as participants in a congruous Truth, we find our place in a Holy Society. They who dwell with God dwell also of necessity with one another. If we are "begotten again through the word of God," (1 Peter 1:23), if Truth is the food of souls, then they who are nourished by the same Truth must needs be quickened into a common life.

But while the Truth is one and the Teacher is one, the obvious varieties of personal gift draw out different elements in the wisdom of God, just as variety of object ab-

sorbs from the light of one sun different hues. It is here we gain through our fellowship. We are continually being offered fresh instruction through experiences we ourselves have never tasted. And the more truly we are loyal to each other the more fully will our individual gift be supplemented. Then for the bare melody chanted in our hidden life will the whole Society of the Redeemed write harmonies deeper than we could ever have conceived, and our joy will be complete.

Here is indicated to us the nature of the end we are approaching. The task of the Spirit will be fulfilled when we are “perfected into one.” (Jno. 17:23). For the realization of that achievement the method and matter of revelation are determined, meeting us just where we are in the course of life, and dealing with us not as isolated individuals, but as those who in their mutual relations possess the possibilities of the social life of God. The end of Revelation is the fulfillment of the prayer of our Lord, “That they may all be one: even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may also be in us.”—Jno. 17:21.

THE LAYMAN AND HIS HOME.

BY PROFESSOR R. E. GAINES, RICHMOND COLLEGE.

Education has come to be a supreme concern of the human race. It is on account of the responsiveness of the human being to the educational process that one generation can pass its experience on to the next, and thus the volume of human knowledge is steadily growing from century to century. But just in proportion as the race advances in wisdom the children of successive generations are born more ignorant for the simple reason that there is more to be ignorant of. That is, as the environment becomes more complex, the problem of adjusting the individual life to it becomes more important and requires a longer time. Thus as civilization advances, the need for education instead of diminishing, is steadily increasing.

The savage in the jungles of Africa needs for his simple life far less training than the civilized man. The same thing is true, though in less degree, of the ditcher as compared with the doctor. The higher a man's calling, the more he needs training. If our supreme task is in the realm of Christian service, surely more attention should be given to the training of the layman. Why should we degrade our high calling by putting it on the plane of "unskilled labor" for which no special training is needed?

Interest in the matter of training is increasing also because of our growing appreciation of the social significance of our modern life. We have come a long way through the centuries from savagery to civilization; and it has been through constant struggle that this civilization has been achieved and human life has been institutionalized and socialized. Nor are these changes alone in the outer aspects of life. Equally great changes have been wrought in the inner man. We are infinitely remov-

ed from the savage. Man has reared a splendid civilization, and at the same time this civilization is rearing a very different man. With a growing appreciation of the great social forces which are thus guiding and shaping human progress, there is emerging a consciousness of social responsibility, and a recognition of the fact that these forces which so powerfully affect the life of the individual may be brought under social control.

The church, therefore, is directly interested in our social institutions. This means far more than merely looking on, and deploring their deficiencies. We have a direct responsibility for aggressively seeking to spiritualize these forces and to make them minister specifically to the higher life of man.

Of the institutions which we have built up during the past there is none so important as the Home. At the same time it is the one to which we seem to be giving least consideration. It seems strange that in this day when we think so much of efficient schools and churches we should be giving almost no attention to the organization of the important institution. It is true that we spend large sums of money in erecting commodious and modern residences and in equipping them with the latest conveniences; but while these are important as furnishing a suitable place for a home they do not make one, for the simple reason that a home is not a place but an institution.

Moreover we live in a day when the home is undergoing changes which are radical and far reaching,—changes which so far as we can see, are lowering rather than raising its efficiency. We may consider for a moment one of these changes, not only because it is in itself so significant, but because it is so intimately related to other changes we view with increasing uneasiness. In the days of our grandfathers the typical home was a very busy place. It provided many of the things which the family needed, thus affording employment of various sorts for

the several members of the family. Thus the home had a multitude of economic activities. These have been transferred almost bodily, to the factories of various sorts. The loss of these economic activities gives the home more time for discharging its higher duties, and therefore might be turned into an advantage. But unfortunately, many a home has lost the lower, and seems to be unaware of its higher mission, and thus finds itself without an adequate task. An institution, as well as a physical organ, atrophies when it ceases to function,—if it remains long out of a job it goes out of business. Thus some of our homes are going out of business,—and into the divorce courts.

Marriage entails responsibilities and demands individual sacrifices. Of course in every true marriage the rewards immeasurably outweigh all sacrifice that it calls for. Those who are unwilling to assume its obligations are unworthy to enter into this holy estate. One of these obligations is to have a home—to provide a suitable place in which the family life can develop according to a well ordered plan. For this it is necessary not only to have a home but to control it, allowing no one the freedom of the home who would attempt to hinder us in carrying out the plan, no matter how rich or near of kin he may be. We would not allow one to slip into the nursery at midnight and poison the children; nor should we allow one to come into the family circle and express views of life which are hostile to all the ideals which we are trying to build up in the minds and hearts of those whose nurture God has entrusted to our care.

There are many aspects of the family life which are important from the church's point of view, and it is not easy to decide which to select for discussion in one brief paper. Even if we confine the attention to religious education, we must include far more than is commonly thought of as comprehended in that term. It is the nurture and development of the whole being with reference

to spiritual ends; it is fitting one for complete living in the Kingdom of God here on earth. Even the physical life plays an important part in this, for it is the basis of all that higher life which we value so much, and powerfully influences both its development and its expression. We realize, at least in a measure, that ill health in a growing child may lead to a weak constitution and impaired usefulness later on. But many persons seem not to appreciate the fact that unfavorable physical conditions in the child have a profound influence on the development of the life itself. It is not merely a danger that the personality will be imprisoned in a feeble body, but the danger is that the personality itself will not develop.

The development of every life is a real unfolding. The child is born absolutely ignorant, but begins at once to acquire knowledge of the outer world through the physical senses, and to feed upon the environment which exerts a powerful shaping influence on its life. For the growth of knowledge there is needed good health and normal physical senses, so that there may be keen perception and ever widening experience. Any deficiency here will permanently contract the nature and rob life of much of its significance, because we are constantly interpreting the new in terms of the old. As we look at the outer world in the light of the knowledge within which past experience has provided, this outer world grows richer in meaning as the soul within grows larger. That is, education not only puts a larger man in the world, but it creates for the man an ever expanding world. But it must be remembered that this whole process is very dependent on clear vision, acute hearing, and trained sense of touch. This fact that the very growth of the soul has an important physical basis ought to set the whole question of physical well-being on a higher plane. We are just beginning in our public schools to provide a competent medical staff to give every child a thorough physical examination, to make sure that he has normal sight

and hearing and is free from disease, and even to provide instruction for parents in the proper care of the health of the child so that he may profit by the splendid system of education which is provided at public expense. Ought not the church to be at least as much interested as the state in the growth of the human soul?

With the rapid development of our system of education, particularly of our public schools, there is far less teaching done in the home. Governesses and tutors who used to be quite common are now almost unknown. At the same time religious teaching and especially the use of the Bible has almost entirely disappeared from the home. No doubt secular education has greatly profited by this change; but religious education has fallen by the wayside. In most of our public schools the Bible is specifically excluded from the curriculum. It is true that in some places the Sunday-school has been greatly improved. But what can you do with a growing boy if you get a chance at him only one hour in a whole week?

The Bible ought to be a larger factor in our homes. I am not sure about the wisdom of teaching it too much like a text-book and assigning tasks to be done, except in the important matter of co-operating with the Sunday-school in the systematic work which it assigns; but I am very sure the Bible ought to be used far more in the home for devotional reading, and especially as a guide to the daily life. We are too much given to reverencing the Bible with no particular concern about comprehending it and living it out in our lives. We should be greatly disturbed if our children were ignorant of the divine origin of the Bible or had any doubt about its inspiration, but we regard it a light matter that they should be entirely ignorant of what God inspired the writers of the Bible to say.

Much of the Bible is not only charming to children, but nourishes the social and intellectual and spiritual life. Parents should select such portions and make them vital to the child, and habitually interpret them in terms of

the child's daily experiences. The Bible is designed to be a guide to the life; and it is most potent in giving direction to the life of a growing youth if it is presented in such way as to get into the center of one's interests and activities. The trouble with many a person is that he fences off a little sphere of life which he calls religious and which he allows to become perfectly stagnant,—and he confines his Bible to this sphere. So it does not get a chance to guide the part of the life that is moving

We need not only to restore family worship, but we should make it an exercise which will really minister to the child's need; and this will mean of course an exercise in which the child can have an active part. The Sunday-school has discovered the important truth that a program which makes the children mere spectators is an empty performance. Is it not the duty of the church to force this upon the attention of the family also? Family worship might become much less formal and still be full of reverence. It ought to be made real and vital to all the family. But in order that it shall render this larger service the father must, as Mr. Cope says, "cease to be the high priest for the family and become a worshipper along with them."

But for all these things, you will say, many earnest fathers and mothers have little competence, and without aid from some source would blunder seriously. Why then does the church remain indifferent to so serious and pressing a need? It is a case which calls for leadership of the highest kind.

But there is more needed than direct teaching. In fact it is quite possible that the indirect teaching in an ideal home is more important and more potent in shaping character than the direct. Truth becomes significant to us only when it is related to life, and its value is directly proportional to the extent to which it fits itself into human life and ministers to human need. The parent therefore must do more than impart knowledge,—

he must be an interpreter of life. Especially must he interpret the daily experiences of the child, the ordinary occurrences of life, in order to bring out their deeper significance and link them up with those things that make life worth while.

There are certain great ideals that must be dominant in every life that is to count for much in this world. And with rare exceptions these find lodgement in the mind and heart in the period of adolescence,—the plastic period when the spirit is so open to all the finer influences, the time when the whole nature is in upheaval, allowing everything that comes into it to be interwoven into the very fiber of one's being. You can easily get an idea into a man's head after he is forty years old, but you cannot get it down into his lower nervous system where it will determine his habitual attitudes and guide his habitual conduct. Only those ideals that have been breathed in from the very atmosphere of the home have much chance of becoming a dynamic in the life. The creative influences in almost every life come from the home. The forming of character is a slow process, but it is continuous and progressive and the foundations for it are laid in the early years.

At the close of a district association in Virginia a man invited me home with him, and he told me on the way that he had a seventeen year old son whom he wanted to send to college. He wanted me to get the boy interested in this plan. I had not been in the home long, however, before I realized that the father expected me in one short evening to convert the boy to a whole program of life to which a college education is merely incidental, when for seventeen long years the whole current of the family life had been toward the exaltation of money with no reference to inner values or to the sacredness and worth of personality. "Table talk in the home is more potent than teacher talk in the school or preacher talk in the church."

But if the home, in its organization, in its activities, and in its atmosphere is thus to minister to the child's

needs and fit him for the fullest, richest life, we need an intelligent understanding of the nature of the child, for nurture must be made to fit the nature. Many parents have blundered sadly, not because they did not love their children, but because they did not understand them. The finer the nature the more need of such knowledge. A man who knows little about horses may break a plug that is incapable of much training, but he would ruin a thoroughbred. Just so it often happens that the children of the very finest possibilities are the very ones who are most completely ruined through our ignorant blundering.

The study of child nature has thrown a flood of light on the Sunday-school teacher's problems, and more and more the church is insisting on her teachers getting this preparation. But parents need it far more than Sunday-school teachers. In fact the home is the only place where we can carry out at all fully the methods which a study of child nature suggests. Many persons seem to take it for granted that the nurture of very small children is a comparatively simple matter and may be entrusted to the most incompetent members of society. They are as a rule easy to control and are not capable of receiving much formal instruction. But controlling a child and guiding its life aright are two very different things. Moreover while there is little formal teaching there is large moulding done. From birth up to nine or ten years of age, the child passes through a period of rapid growth and great plasticity. With impressible activity he is running into all sorts of new experiences that will affect the whole subsequent life. He is drinking in and absorbing a complex environment, is powerfully influenced by example, and is unconsciously imitating what goes on around him. The whole environment is making a deep impression on his sensitive nature and is in large measure shaping his life. When we remember that parental care if properly directed has the power to modify and shape all this nurture, and thus shape the na-

ture, it is almost unbelievable that one would undertake the delicate task of rearing and training a child with no knowledge of child nature and with no effort to acquire such knowledge. And how can the church ignore so solemn and so obvious an obligation as that of preparing men and women through systematic training for the high and holy function of parenthood?

Each period in the development of the child presents its own special problems. One may be quite competent to manage little children and fail seriously with older boys and girls. The Sunday school teacher may remain in the primary department, but the father and mother must keep pace with the rapid development of their children and modify their program from year to year. The junior age, as it is called, which is such a live problem in the Sunday-school, is an equally pressing problem in the home. The typical boy of ten or twelve years of age is quite able to take care of himself, thus no longer needing the help and protection of adults, and he has not yet acquired the interests of adults and hence is more independent of them than either younger children or those of maturer years. He is absorbed in the physical world in action, the higher world which—so significant to grown people—makes little or no appeal to him. He sometimes behaves much like a little savage and seems to give color to that recapitulation theory by living the life of his remote ancestors who dwelt in caves and robbed the neighboring tribes. He is a misfit in modern society. He delights to be out in the open, and lives a wild free life of body building and habit forming and of adjusting himself to the physical world. If you would guide this growth you must go out in the open with him. This is the period in which the boy exhibits that striking and curious character which we call hero-worship, when he wants some big strong man “to be partners with him.” But the big strong man must get into the boy’s world, and so he must know that world. Nine times out

of ten the boy would choose his father above all other persons to be his hero; and not one father in ten has sense enough to see this. Many a home is throwing away a great opportunity here, and in almost every case it is for lack of knowledge.

There is all the more need for establishing this relation of comradeship with the boy in the junior age, because just ahead of him are the rapids, when he is to pass through the most critical period in the whole course of human life,—the period of early adolescence. When he enters this period his whole point of view will undergo a marked change. Up to this time he has cared little for what we call the higher world, but has been exploring the physical world and adjusting himself to it, living out in the open, building huts in the woods and being as near a savage as his mother will allow. In adolescence he is initiated into a new world, is putting aside his savagery and getting ready for modern civilization, “he is building a second story on his primal nature.” It is a period of the awakening of new powers, a period of great danger, but of limitless possibilities. It is a time when there come rushing into the mind new conceptions of God, of human society, of modern civilization, of human achievement, of heroism, of personal responsibility. These changes come sometimes with surprising swiftness, and the sense of independence which was so characteristic of the wild free life which he has been living suddenly gives way to a feeling of bewilderment and helplessness amidst the vastness and complexity of this higher world which opens out before his vision. He instinctively feels the need of a strong sympathetic hand to hold and steady him. He needs guidance as at no other time. It will be fortunate if he can turn to father and mother for this service. But this will be impossible unless they have all along been his friends and companions, and have that sympathetic understanding of a growing, expanding life which will enable them to get inside of his heart and look

out on the world through his eyes, and minister to the nature which God has given him rather than to such a nature as they imagine he ought to have had.

This is the period, if previous nurture has paved the way, which affords the largest opportunities for creating the ideals which are to be dominant in subsequent life,—which in fact are to determine the plane on which the whole life is to be projected. Just at this time when he is beginning to be keenly interested in the social, the business and the political world the ideals which prevail in the home will determine in large measure what is to be, throughout all subsequent life, his attitude toward social responsibility, business integrity, and worthy citizenship. He is becoming aware of the world's social distinctions, and is observing with keenest interest the rating which public opinion is assigning to men and families in the community. He may wonder why men are rated, not by any qualities which inhere in the men themselves, but by the mere accident of how much material wealth they possess, with no reference even as to how it was obtained. Our whole life is so overlaid with a crust of materialism, the tendency is so universal to exalt money and material success to the disparagement of character, that no young life is safe which is not fortified against all this by ideals which put personality far above property. In multitudes of Christian homes the conversation is almost incessantly exalting money. When the neighbors are under discussion it is perfectly obvious that this test is invariably applied and they are rated according to their bank accounts. If there is a new-comer in the community the first question that is asked,—the only question that counts for much— is “How much is he worth?” How can a Christian home ignore the truth that a man's worth depends not on what he has piled up around him, but upon what he has built up within him?

If we could realize the power of ideals in determining the whole direction of the life, and that practically all of

the ideals of the adult are those which were bequeathed to him by the home of his childhood, surely the church would give itself more earnestly to the problem of making more efficient Christian homes. We can guide a ship only when it is moving, and we determine the shape and size of a house when it is building. And the time to give both magnitude and direction, both dynamic and vision to a life is in its spring-time, in adolescence when the life can so easily swing this way or that, and before the nature has hardened into selfishness and littleness, and all the finer sensibilities have been benumbed by a social order whose whole atmosphere is heavy with ideals which are a direct and complete denial of the Christian program.

We have been thinking of the internal organization of the home with especial reference to the service which it ought to render to the children within the family circle. But no home can live to itself. And an institution of such potency as a Christian home cannot exemplify the spirit of Christ if it is unwilling to render unselfish service to the world and make itself an aggressive force for establishing the Kingdom of God on Earth.

The home has an important relation to the church—a relation which ought to be more fully recognized. It can do much to promote the plans of the church. Not only should it be the chief factor in bringing the child to Christ, but it should train him for church service, helping him to cultivate habits of attending the various meetings of the church and supporting its enterprises. It should foster in the mind of the child high ideals as to the mission of the church in the world and as to its claims upon our time and thought and love and loyalty. It should cultivate enthusiasm for the local church and for the denomination and foster the spirit of loyalty to its entire program. The internal organization of the home should facilitate the fullest co-operation with the church, the schedule of meals, the distribution of duties and plans for recreation all having reference to the program of the

church, so as to make it easy for every member of the family to be a member of the church "in good standing and full fellowship,"—giving to that familiar phrase the meaning which it ought to have. The father and mother should study their children to discover in them aptitudes for special kinds of service and encourage them to find their proper places in the various organizations of the church.

The home sustains a very vital relation also to the community, and is not only affected by the community life, but has a responsibility to share in and contribute to that life. Sometimes a whole neighborhood is demoralized by a single home with its social gambling and dissipation, its irreverence and lawlessness, its materialism and selfishness, its vulgar display and sensuality,—with an atmosphere which poisons every young life that enters it and pollutes the streams of the whole social structure. Then there is the pure, generous, wholesome type which is an uplifting social and spiritual force in the community. The great multitude of homes belong to neither of these classes. Why should Christian people complain of one type unless they are earnestly striving to make their homes conform to the other type?

Some good people persist in complaining of society as not only apart from the Christian life but hostile to it. We lengthen our faces and shake our heads and say of a neighbor's daughter "She's gone off into society." But whose fault is it that society is so far away? Who is responsible for the state of things which made it necessary for this precious girl to go off somewhere to gratify this social craving which God Himself put into her heart? Have we not the making of society? But we can never carry society our way so long as our policy is to ignore these natural and tremendously important social needs of people. The officers and church members who have never, either in their homes or in the larger family life of the church, made any provision whatever for the social

needs of people have no right to make objection when the young men and maidens avail themselves of such social activities as the community affords. Many people think that the present forms of social recreation are harmful in their tendencies. Then why do they force their children to a choice between death from poisoning and death from starvation? It is not merely a matter of gratifying a social craving but of nurturing a social nature, without which there is little hope that in adult life there will be large capacity for social ministry.

The Christian homes in almost any community could revolutionize the whole social program of the young people, and put a new joy into their young lives, if they went about it in earnest, and with real insight into the nature and needs of growing youth. Thus the social life would be made the ally instead of the enemy of spiritual growth. Young people have enormous surplus energy and large social instincts, and they usually have a good deal of leisure in which to expend this energy and gratify these instincts. In guiding these activities the home has an opportunity the significance and value of which we wholly underestimate. But we must interpret our task as one, not of repression, but of intelligent and sympathetic guidance.

But, you will say, one family can exert very slight influence on the recreational life of a whole community, and therefore it is practically helpless. Quite true. Then why should not Christian homes combine in establishing a suitable and adequate recreational program for the community just as through cooperative effort they establish an adequate educational program? We live in a world that has become preeminently cooperative and institutionalized, and unless we as Christians can somehow be freed from the slavery of our exaggerated individualism, we shall never be able to make Christianity a constructive force in the community.

In the heart of every normal young person there are two strong cravings; namely, the desire for achievement and for companionship,—for something to do, and for somebody to play with and to help him do. And too often both the home and the church are blind to both of these cravings.

LUTHER'S FIRST TRIAL.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER,
DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

On the strength of the Resolutions and the Sermon on Excommunication* we may say that in 1518 (a few months after the nailing of the 95 Theses, Oct. 30, 1517) Luther had reached the following conclusions,—so quickly did he loosen himself from many of the ideas in which he was brought up. The New Testament word for penance or penitence means simply change of mind and feeling. True penitence must mount up to God from love of righteousness, and there is no importance in Catholic acts of penance. We are forgiven without these penances by simply trusting in Christ's mercy, because God loves us and wants to forgive us if we believe, even before the priest's absolution. The value of the latter is only to make us (especially the despairing) sure of God's forgiveness by an external sign. The priest forgives not on account of his power but on account of the promise of Christ in Matt. 16:19 and 18:18. It is the promise not the priest that forgives, and this we have because we believe. The doctrine that the sacraments work *ex opere operato* (by their mere administration, without the faith of the recipient, provided he does not present a positive barrier of unabsolved mortal sin) is false. It is faith alone that brings salvation, but the absolution of the priest is useful to a troubled conscience. As to the doctrine of the treasury of merits (*viz.*, that through the superabundant merits of Christ, Mary and saints there has been laid up a storehouse of merits for the Church, administered by the pope through his ministers, a doc-

**Resolutiones disputationis de virtute indulgentiae*, in Erl. ed. of Latin works i. 222ff., 77ff. Weim ed. i. 522. *Sermo de virtute excommunicationis* in same, extensive summary and extracts in Köstlin's *Luther*, 5th Aufl. i. 177ff.

trine which goes back in definite fixing to Alexander of Hales, who died 1245), faith may receive something thence, but not an indulgence. Saints have no treasury of merits to spare, because the commandment is exceeding broad and sin cleaves to the best work. Papal power is to be respected; it reaches to the external things of Christianity, and is to be obeyed when not contradictory to Christ. The pope sometimes binds those who are not bound. There was once a time when the papal power did not exist, at least over the Greeks. Still that power is of God as being providential in the sense that a king's is, and must therefore be obeyed. The pope has not two swords, the worldly and spiritual, by which the pope becomes a tyrant and burns heretics. The Church needs reformation, but God only knows the time for that. He (Luther) holds only what Scripture, Fathers and papal canons teach, but reserves right to reject sentences of the latter not well founded. He wants to be in and with the Roman Church and so rejects the 'Picards', the separated Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, though they are not to be persecuted. But I must speak against evils, even if you hold me for a heretic. I stand by Christ who has compelled me to this step. The merits of Christ are not given with an indulgence, even if the pope grants it.

In his reply to Prierias (same year) he says: I find the Church nowhere except in Christ, and her representation nowhere except in a Council. Still the faith of the Catholic Roman Church is right, and according to this should the faith of all Christians be found; for in spite of all moral corruptions Christ has preserved the faith in this Church as by a miracle. She has never denied the true faith by a formal decision, and has held to the canonical books of the Bible and to the Church Fathers, though men in her have neither believed in the Bible nor cared for it. I would be a heretic if I did not hold what the Church decided. I say with Augustine: I have learned to honor only the canonical books of the

Bible, as I believe none of their authors have erred. Both the pope and a council may err. This was taught at the Council of Basel (1431-49) by Nicholas de Tudesco, archbishop of Palermo, who attributed infallibility neither to Council nor pope, but only to the universal Church. Neither did d'Ailli believe that the infallibility of a Council was a necessary doctrine. (From the Sermon on Excommunication :) Excommunication is exclusion from the communion of believers. This is twofold, an inner or spiritual, a communion of faith, hope and love to God, and an external or bodily. The first is under God alone, and He alone can give or take it. Excommunication by the Church affects only the external communion, not the spiritual blessings of the Church. If a man is excommunicated not for actual sins, but for some righteous cause, he is not thereby damned but rather blessed. Such a ban is the noblest merit. But under a ban one should be patient and bear sufferings as did Christ under Caiaphas and Pilate.

Without knowing it, Luther had broken entirely with the Roman Church. His evangelical principles had as early as 1518 undermined his old faith. It was heresy to say that faith gave one all the blessings of sacrament and absolution. That made the inner attitude everything, gave faith an absolute value and the external Church and her sacraments and priests a relative value only. To say that the Church fundamentally was not pope and hierarchy was treason to Catholicism, was treason in fact to any High Church view, and to appeal from that hierarchy to Scripture as the only infallible guide was also treason. Luther did not see where his principles were leading him—in fact he never followed them implicitly—but the Catholic authorities saw that he was sailing out beyond their reach and they must try to bring him to land.

It was a providential thing for the Reformation that the pope during these epoch-making years, viz., Leo X

(1513-21), was a Humanist, interested much in art and literature, but not equally in theology and a pure orthodox Catholic Church. A pope who could remain on friendly terms with such an outspoken critic of Church abuses and of many opinions dear to most Catholic theologians as Erasmus, who was entirely out of sympathy with the whole mediæval development and criticized even a St. Thomas Aquinas, was exactly the pope to have on the throne when a more radical reformer lays his axe to the root. What if a pope touched with the fiery zeal of Theatine or Jesuit had been wearing the triple crown! When Luther first came out, some noble Romans were complaining to Leo over his indifference in the matter. "O," said he, "I guess Luther is a right good fellow, and the strife only a zealous squabble of monks!" When the 95 Theses were posted, Leo made light of them. "I guess a full, drunken German has written them," he said; "when he becomes sober he will think otherwise"* That does not mean that Leo did not believe himself to be pope in the highest sense then accepted. Six months before the 95 Theses a so-called Ecumenical Council (it was not, for it was composed mostly of only Italian bishops dependent on the pope) had closed its doors in the Lateran palace, but before it did so it had laid in the dust the rights of Councils fought for for a hundred years by many of the greatest saints, scholars, princes and theologians of the Church, and put forth the beautiful Christian claim that the pope is the "prince of the whole world," in fact "another God upon earth." This same easy-going Humanist pope sent forth the famous bull *Pastor aeternus*, Dec. 19, 1516, from the eleventh session of that Council, in which the pope was lifted high over a Council, so that he alone has the "full right and power of calling, transferring and dissolving councils," and also by name gave solemn ratification to the notorious bull

*Op. var. arg. 2. 349; Tischreden, ed. Förstemann and Bindseil 3. 197.

Unam sanctam (1302) which was almost the highwater mark of Roman pretension in the Middle Ages.** Yet though Leo represented the papal rather than the conciliar view of the relation of pope to Church, his large interests and artistic sensuous temperament were certainly an advantage to Luther at this early time.

There was a man in Rome near the pope, Silvester Mazzolini, generally called Prierias from his birthplace Prierio, who was Master of the Sacred Palace, that is, head teacher and director of the crowd of lackeys and servants at the pope's disposal. At the same time he was censor of books and inquisitor and judge in matters of faith. And he was worthy of his honors. He was Dominican monk of earnest faith sunk in study of his favorite Aquinas. He felt himself called to come to the defense of the faith attacked as he believed by that hardy German Augustinian Brother Martin in his 95 Theses: *Dialogus in praesumptuosas Martini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papae*, 1518. The learned Dominican treats the unknown Augustinian with contempt, "eagerly anxious (he says) to test his iron nose and do up his brazen head." The Dialogue is simply a statement of the regular ultramontane doctrine of papal supremacy, more at home in Italy than in Germany and France, rejected by teachers held in honor in Erfurt University where Luther had studied, theologians like Occam, d'Ailli, Gerson, who repudiated it without being heretics. The Church is the hierarchy, especially the pope. As the Church cannot err in matters of faith and life, neither can the pope, when he determines anything as pope. "Whoever says in regard to an Indulgence that the Roman Church cannot do what she really does, he is a heretic." He calls Luther a leper who carries a varied hide playing in true and false colors. If biting is the quality of a dog, Luther must have had a dog for his father, for he seems born

**For these bulls see Mirbt, *Quellen zur Gesch. d. Papsttums*, 2 Aufl., nos. 244, 270.

as a biter. If the pope had given him a bishopric with the power to dispense Indulgences, he would have praised them and overflowed with sweet words.

We all complain of the violence of Luther as a controversialist and his coarseness. But it is fair to say that in Prierias he had an eminent example and prompter on the Roman side, who started the ball in this way. In debate it is natural to give what you receive, as everyone is not a John Fletcher. But when you attack the peasant's son for violating the amenities of courteous discussion, remember the cultured 60 year old scholar of polite civilized Rome who gave him his first lessons.*

According to the high papal theory, now a dogma through *Pastor aeternus* and other bulls, one could easily prove Luther a heretic. The papal fiscal therefore entered formal complaint in that sense. This required a preliminary investigation. Now notice the two men the pope appointed for this, a nice light on the feeling for justice in the papal court. The first was this very Prierias, who had already not only condemned but abused Luther, and was therefore incompetent as judge. The other was Ghinucci, auditor of the papal camera, bishop of Ascoli, concerned with financial and legal things, no theologian, and therefore dependent upon Prierias. The fate of Luther therefore in this investigation depended upon one man alone and that one his declared enemy. Now followed a citation to Luther dated Aug. 7, 1518 summoning him to Rome within sixty days. If he had gone?

We now come to a man famous in this history— Jacobo Vio, of Gaeta, and from this place called Gaetano, Cajetan, like Prierias both a Dominican and a thorough student of St. Thomas of Aquino, later procurator general of his order, wrote a book in defense of high papal theory,

*Luther reprinted Prierias's first book against him in his reply, and it can be found in his Works, Latin Erl. 1. 314ff, 2. 349ff, Weim, ed. 1 644ff, and arranged under the theses in Köhler, *Luther's 95 Thesen*, Leipz. 1903.

represented that theory at the Lateran Council already spoken of and carried through a decision in that sense, and for this was made cardinal presbyter and bishop 1517, and in 1518 was sent as papal legate to the Reichstag in Augsburg, where he clothed archbishop of Mainz Albrecht with the cardinal's insignia, and to the emperor Maximilian brought a consecrated hat and sword. He was also to try to move the emperor and the king of Denmark and Sweden to war against the Turks, for which the Council had laid a tax of a tenth on Christendom, as well as to clear Bohemia of heresy. Though Luther was not mentioned in the pope's commission, yet Cajetan was certainly the man naturally designated to bring him to terms also. He was a theologian, a thorough papalist, but with all the suavity and cleverness of a man of the world.

What was Maximilian's attitude to Luther? As Holy Roman Emperor, he was the champion of the Church, of course a hearty Catholic, and if he had taken at the start a rough and ready method with the poor monk of Wittenberg, history might have been different. He was now bordering on 60, and though alert and interested in letters and affairs, a man of unusual ability for a ruler and of many noble traits, he was soon to be called to a Higher Tribunal where king and peasant enter with equal hands. Two or three things prevented decisive action against Luther on the part of Maximilian. He was anxious not to alienate Luther's prince, the elector Frederick the Wise, because he wanted his vote to help elect his grandson Charles to succeed himself. He had no inner knowledge of Luther's religious point of view, but he was knight and romanticist enough to enjoy his bold challenge of abuses, and clever statesman enough not to interfere. On Aug. 5, 1518 he wrote to the pope of complaints concerning Luther's Theses, of which he had received knowledge a few days before, put the matter up to the papal wisdom and power, but thought the

dispute was only a sophistic curious quarrel among theological Masters. "Your Holiness alone is able and ought to silence the authors of vain questions, sophisms and wordy quarrels." He urges the pope to take a hand.** Ah, clever kaiser, how little thou knowest after all! To Frederick's councillor Pfeffinger he spoke in a different strain: Luther's Theses are not to be despised; he has begun a play with the parsons; the elector better guard the monk well, because he may be needed later. Maximilian got the Humanist Wimpheling, one of the most advanced and liberal scholars (also a clergyman) of his time, to send out a paper on the Luther affair, in which this able man, who himself was thoroughly disgusted with Church abuses, advises to let the transactions between Luther and the pope draw along slowly as they would, until the bishops themselves will demand a Reformation, and then the emperor as protector of the Church will have opportunity to step in. What if Wimpheling had urged to put Luther down immediately! What if Maximilian had been a fanatical Catholic! What if Ignatius Loyola had not been then only 27 years old and still a worldly knight! How many providential slips between the cup and the lip which enabled the Reformation to get a foothold in a Catholic world!

But the position of Luther was dangerous in the extreme. Some of his admissions in his answer to the Dialogue of Prierias were offensive even to moderate or conciliar Catholics. He had pushed his Biblical principle to its logical result—which his historical knowledge also helped along—that both pope and council might err, though he had not yet said that they actually had erred. He still believed or wanted to believe that in fundamental things the Church had not legally and solemnly announced false doctrine. But even in this early fateful year of 1518 he had lost confidence in the infallibility of either

**See this letter in translation in Smith, *Luther's Correspondence*, Philadelphia 98-100, 1913.

pope or council. Then on May 16 he had preached a sermon to his congregation in Wittenberg on the ban, sentences of which had been carried far and wide and had embarrassed his friends and offended his enemies. These sentences were even reported at the Reichstag sitting in Augsburg, and came into the hands of legate cardinal Cajetan. They made an impression on the emperor, for in his letter already spoken of he refers to them. But, as if to pile Pelion on Ossa, the not worldly wise Luther, even after receiving his summons to Rome, wrote down his extemporaneous sermon from memory, and had it published, though in Latin (see above for some points he made). The secretary and chaplain of Frederick, Spalatin, had written him urging him not to publish, but the letter came too late.

Now the important question comes, Why did not Luther obey the citation to Rome? Why did he remain in Germany? All of Luther's friends were opposed to his going, for they feared that that would be the last of him. Then there was no love lost between Germany and Rome on account of the exploitation of German resources by papal officers. This very Reichstag refused the papal request for a tax against the Turks, and repeated their old complaints against the unauthorized and avaricious inroads of the pope on German affairs. (Catholic writers often inveigh against the Reformer for opposing this tax as a sign of his selfish indifference to the weal of Europe. But this Diet was Catholic, and orthodox France and Spain opposed it too. They saw in it another attempt to fill papal coffers). At Augsburg during the Diet, Frederick personally interviewed the cardinal and asked for a hearing not in Rome but in Germany. And the pope was not inclined to needlessly oppose the elector, because he wanted the latter's assistance in turning down the imperial ambitions of Maximilian for his grandson Charles, ruler of Spain and Naples. In fact he sent him the Golden Rose as a marked sign of his favor. Besides during

the last half of the fifteenth century there had been an extension of the Church rights of bishops and princes, among others hearings for heresy and other delinquencies under native judges.

But Rome was not at all disposed to let Luther go. On August 23, 1518, the pope commanded Cajetan, as he understood Luther kept on with his offensive writings, to cite him immediately before himself (Cajetan)—if necessary with the help of kaiser and estates—as one whom the preliminary investigation at Rome had found a heretic, and in case Luther did not recant to keep him fast, pending further instructions from Rome. In case he did not obey the citation, then Cajetan was to excommunicate him and his followers as heretics. The preliminary report to the pope was not a final decision and was not meant to prejudice the trial before Cajetan (though it must have had a moral influence unfavorable to Luther), but was something like our Grand Jury findings. At the same time the pope wrote to Frederick that Luther was a “child of evil,” who boasted of his protection by him, and demanded that at the requisition of Cajetan he turn him over into the hands of the papal chair.* Then again at the instance of the pope, the general of the Augustinian Order, to which Luther belonged, issued an order to the Saxon provincial to imprison Luther and hold him fast.** It looked dark for the monk. The elector’s request for a hearing in Germany was sent to Rome, was granted, Cajetan was designated as judge, and Frederick acquiesced in Luther’s going to Augsburg.

It looked dark. So much so that the Basel preacher Capito, who even now was looking after an edition of Luther’s writings in Basel, wrote Sept. 4, to Luther that though he was furnished with the weapons of truth, and his enemies with those of quite another kind, he must not open his breast so frankly to their attacks, particularly

*See Smith, *ibid.*, 105-6.

**Smith, 106-8.

must not excite the pope against him, but in disputing be sure to leave a window open to get out,*** etc. Staupitz, Luther's old monastic friend and superior, was distressed. He wrote to Spalatin making Luther's cause his own, setting his hope upon the all ruling God and upon the truth which has to be witnessed to by suffering and death, and as to the elector he only had this wish that without personal regard to Staupitz or to Luther he would assure to truth a place where it could speak. On Sept. 14 he wrote to Luther himself a brief letter so good that I copy it in Dr. Preserved Smith's translation.

Possess your soul in patience for salvation. I have enough to write to fill a book, but will express myself briefly. It seems to me that the world is exasperated against truth; with so great hatred was Christ crucified, and today I see nothing waiting for you but the cross. Unless I mistake the opinion prevails that no one should examine the Scripture without leave of the pope, in order to find for himself, which Christ certainly commands us to do. You have few defenders, and would that they were not hiding for fear of enemies. I should like you to leave Wittenberg and come to me that we may live and die together. This would also please the archbishop (Matthew Lang, friend of Staupitz, but opposed to Reformation). Here I finish. It is expedient thus to be, that abandoned we may follow Christ. Farewell and a good journey to you.†

Luther's friends urged him strongly not to go even to Augsburg to appear before the cardinal. All Catholics, how little they trusted the Catholic legate. What could Cajetan do with him there except to condemn him, him who was already described by the pope as a "child of sin"? And on the way will they not waylay him (they said) to kill him by sword or poison? In July Count Albrecht of Mansfield had written to Luther's friend John Lang that they must not let Luther leave Wittenberg, for important men had hit upon measures to get rid of him.

****ibid.*, 110-13. ,

†Smith, 1. 113.

But his elector wanted him to go, and he resolved to go. Trusting in the legate's honor, Frederick did not ask from the kaiser a safe conduct. Luther later confessed that he feared for his life. "Now I must die," he said to himself. The stake was before his eyes. "What a shame I shall be to my parents!" This does not mean that he was personally in fear.

As you know, Spalatin, I fear nothing. For even if their sycophancy and power should succeed in making me hateful unto all, yet my heart and conscience would tell me that all things which I have and which they attack I have from God, to whom willingly and of my own accord, I refer them and to whom I offer them. If he takes them away, let them be taken away, if he preserves them let them be preserved, and may his name be holy and blessed forever. Amen. I do not see in what way I can escape all their censures unless the elector helps me. On the other hand, I would much prefer to be always under their censures than to make the elector incur odium for my sake. Therefore, as I formerly offered myself, believe I am still ready to be offered up, and convince of this any other whom you may think fit. I will never be a heretic. I may err in debate, but I wish to decide nothing. Yet I would not be captive to the doctrines of men.*

(From another letter): See how I am threatened by snares and am surrounded by thorns. But Christ lives and reigns yesterday and today and forever. My conscience says that I teach the truth, therefore so much hate . . . Pray for me that I do not become proud and too joyous in this attack. May God not give them success. They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. May God enlighten them with the same light we have.†

Toward the end of September, 1518, Luther set out on foot for Augsburg to meet there not German judges as he wished, but an Italian cardinal. Still Augsburg was better than Rome. He was accompanied by a brother monk from Wittenberg, Leonard Beyer. The elector provided him with a little money for the journey, and letters of recommendation to some leading men of the city. His first stop was Weimar, where in default of an Augustinian

*Smith, p. 109 (letter of Aug. 28, 1518).

†Quoted by Rade, *Luther's Leben*, i. 326.

he was put up at a Franciscan convent, whose head said to him: "Dear Herr Doctor, the Latins are, by heavens! learned people. I fear you will not be able to maintain your cause before them. They will burn you." "Then with nettles," answered Luther, "it would be too hot with fire. Dear friend, pray to our dear Lord God with a Lord's Prayer for me and for his dear child Christ, whose cause mine is, that he will be gracious to it. If he maintains the cause, then it is maintained for me, if not, not. He must bear the shame." He preached at Weimar, but made no reference to these matters. As already said, the elector did not ask for a safe conduct, as he trusted to the honor both of Maximilian and Cajetan. He arrived in Nürnberg (Nuremberg) October 5th, where his friend, Wenceslaus Link, prior of the Augustinian convent there, borrowed for him a decent monk's cowl, as his own was worn out, and also went with him. Here also they worked on his fears with dire prophecies, to which he replied, "Even in Augsburg, in the midst of his enemies Christ reigns, Christ lives, Martin dies!" To mental attacks came as he journeyed on fearful pains in the stomach, so that three miles from Augsburg he had to procure a cart to carry him into the city, October 7th, sick, feverish, and tormented by a demon (as he said) with gloomy thoughts.

Luther was well cared for in the Carmelite monastery, whose prior Frosch had been a student in Wittenberg. The Diet was not entirely over, and the Emperor was still in the neighborhood just now out on a hunt. The eminent men of the city to whom the elector recommended him received him in a friendly manner. All the German advisers in the city urged him not to go before Cajetan before he had the emperor's safe conduct, no doubt with wisdom, as the Italian was specially charged to imprison him. Cajetan was provoked about this, but the emperor granted the letter of safe conduct when he got back from the chase. In the meantime an Italian friend of Cajetan's, Urban of Serralonga, visited Luther unofficially

to sound him and to prepare his master for him. The light-hearted Italian told Luther he need not be afraid of Cajetan, as he is a good-hearted man, and all he needs to do to save himself is simply to utter a little word of six letters, *Revoca*. "I want to defend myself and receive instruction, if I am in error," said Luther. "You wish to put up a play and ride around in a ring?" said Urban. He could not seem to understand that it was a matter of conscience with Luther. "Don't you know it is allowable to speak before the people certain untrue things, if they only bring in good money" (of the indulgence preachers)? "Do you think," the light-hearted Italian continued, "that prince Frederick will take up arms on your account"? "Oh, no," said Luther. "Then where will you stay?" "Under the open sky," replied the German. "But what would you do if you had the pope and the cardinals in your power?" asked he of Serralonga. "I would show them all reverence and honor," said Luther. "Hem!" ejaculated the southerner, with a drastic gesture, and went out not to come back. Luther wrote to Spalatin that the silliness of this mediator increased his courage, but did not give him any confidence.* He had formed a conclusion, if worse came to worst, to appeal to a council.

On Tuesday, October 12, for the first time in his life, Luther came face to face with a cardinal and papal legate. It is an amiable weakness of scholars and clergy to like to be decked out in flaming colors and robes, due partly to a survival of the pre-historic mind with its openness to startling colors, partly to the effeminate side of our nature, and partly to the child-like, to pride and to other causes. Cajetan sought to impress the princes of the empire with these means. His room was hung with red satin, his noble gray horse was covered with red velvet. Though a student and a theologian he found, like his master Leo X, one of his pleasures in these outward adornments, and when Luther came before him, he was clothed with a bril-

*Smith, 116-8.

liant purple robe, as became a cardinal (whence we get the cardinal color). The humble monk and professor had been instructed how to demean himself before the prince of the Church. He had to first throw himself down upon his face, lie there till asked to rise, then get up, but only to his knees, and then on a second hint stand up. This Luther went through.

The Reformer was under the same delusion as Hus when the latter went to Constance. He thought he could state and explain his views, perhaps defend them, receive instruction, and recant only when shown that his views were wrong. In other words, he thought that it would be a real trial and not a foregone condemnation. But not so the Holy Mother Church. Luther began by asking pardon for anything thoughtless he had said or done, and said he was ready to receive instruction and to be shown the right way. Cajetan replied courteously that he had heard of Luther's learning and of his many scholars, that he had no intention to dispute with him, but to settle the matter between them in a fatherly spirit, and that the pope demanded only three things from him: (1) recall his errors, (2) promise to keep from them in the future, and (3) to keep also from everything which might disturb the peace of the Church. Only three conditions and so easy! That there was a religious experience and need, an imperative religious demand, a conscience, a new study of the Bible, a new interest in truth, in life and in one's relation to God,—that there was any one of these things behind the views of Luther the learned cardinal and his masters in Italy neither knew nor cared. Luther asked to see the papal brief where those conditions were laid down. This was refused, as the brief demanded also Luther's imprisonment. "Please show me what errors you mean," said Luther, "as I am not conscious of any." "Two now," said Cajetan, "that you have denied the identity of the treasury of the Church with the merits of Christ, contrary to the bull of Clement VI, and that you

have declared that a saving reception of the sacrament is conditioned on the faith of the receiver." Cajetan was right here. Clement VI in 1343, had given the first formal papal sanction to indulgences and treasury of merits in his famous bull *Unigenitus dei filius* in which he also established the papal jubilee for every fifty years instead of every hundred. In that bull he said that "merits are known to furnish an accumulation in the treasury of the blessed Son of God and of all the elect from the first just one unto the last support, of the consumption and diminution of which nothing is to be feared, both on account of the infinite merits of Christ and of the fact that the more they are drawn upon to increase justice by his application, the more the accumulation of their merits is increased."* You seem to have overlooked that bull, said Cajetan. Luther replied that he knew the bull, also the bull of Sixtus IV (perhaps referring to the bull of 1481 or '82, extending the jubilee indulgence to the dead), but they proved nothing against him, as papal decretals often perverted and misused Scripture. This struck Cajetan at a sore point, as he was a special vindicator of the full papal theory, and therefore declared that a papal bull was to be immediately accepted, as the pope has power over all things, even over councils. As to the point of faith being necessary to the grace of the sacraments, that was now an earnest necessary part of Luther's faith. The cardinal had no understanding for this, and his Italian attendants laughed at Luther's explanations. He could not be drawn into a dispute, and must condemn Luther's whole doctrine unless he recanted. Luther asked for time. I should have said that there accompanied Luther to this interview the Carmelite prior, Frosch, two other monks of the same monastery, his friend the Augustinian prior, Link of Nürnberg, and his travelling companion, Beyer.

*See Herzog-Hauck, R. *Encyk.* 3 Aufl. ix. 83, xiv, 417; Gieseler *Church History*, iii, 162 (§120).

The second audience was granted on Wednesday, the 13th, when Luther appeared with councillor Peutingier, electoral councillor von Feilitzsch, two other imperial councillors, Staupitz who had arrived the day before, and a notary, as Luther was to read a solemn declaration. This declaration ran: "I follow the Roman Church in all its present, past and future words and acts; what is said otherwise take as not said; as regards the three-fold demand, I can seek after truth only by way of disputation, and can, therefore, not recant anything without being first heard and better instructed. I am not conscious of having said anything against Scripture, the Fathers, papal decrees or sound reason. Still I subject myself as a man who can err to the rightful decision of Holy Church, offer to give an account of my teachings, and am ready to answer in writing the legate's objections and to hear concerning them the judgment of the Basel, Freiburg, Louvain, or, if that does not suffice, of Paris, Universities." Cajetan laughed at this solemn statement, and said he advised him simply to give in and turn around, as he would find it hard to kick against the goads. Luther asked earnestly to hear a written defense against the charge of heresy against him by Cajetan yesterday on the two points. Cajetan at first declined as he wished no disputation, but on Staupitz earnestly seconding the request of Luther, Cajetan assented, not as in disputation, but as a father hearing what Luther had to say. We give a few points from this notable paper.

First, as to that bull of Clement. It really perverts the Scripture, as it refers to indulgences expressions which apply to God's justifying grace. It is possible for papal decrees to err. When any written law demands us to hear the voice of the pope as of the Spirit, it means only those utterances which are in harmony with Scripture. As Peter himself was set right on account of a deviation from the truth (Gal. 2:11ff), how much the less can it disturb us when his successor fails. So every Christian has the right to test papal decisions. Any Christian who has better reasons for his opinions than the pope is so far greater than he. Paul says himself that if a revelation comes to

another, the first is to keep silent (1 Cor. 14:30). From Scripture and Augustine it is proved that the bull of Clement erred when it called the merits of the saints a treasury; for the saints are sinners, and are saved only through God's mercy. If the bull means that through Christ's merits he gave the keys to Peter, all right. Christ is himself the treasure, but not properly the treasure from which indulgences can be drawn. (He then tries to interpret the bull in his own sense, and of course fails. But he will not take the bull as it reads as decisive for him.) As to faith being the chief thing: "Only faith in Christ's word justifies, makes worthy, makes living, prepares for the sacrament. Without faith it is only a striving of one's own presumption or despair; for—the just lives by his faith." (He quotes passages from Augustine and Bernard of Clairvaux, and concludes): These and many other proof-passages compel me, take me captive, lead me to the doctrine which I have spoken. Therefore, Most Reverend Father in Christ, I pray you humbly, proceed mildly with me, have mercy on my conscience, give me a light by which I might understand this otherwise, and do not compel me to recant what my conscience will not allow me to hold otherwise. While these proofs stand, I can do no otherwise, and know only that one must obey God rather than men. May Your Most Reverend Paternity intercede for me with our holiest Lord, Leo X, that he may not with ungracious severity toss my soul out into the darkness, which seeks only the light of truth and is quite ready to give in in everything and to recall when it is better instructed. I am not so presumptuous nor eager for idle honor that I am ashamed to recall what has been evilly said. In fact my greatest joy is to see the truth triumph. Only let no man compel me to do anything against my conscience. For I believe without any doubt that that is the doctrine of Holy Scripture."*

I must agree with Köstlin (*Luther*, 5 Aufl. i. 209) that the moment when Luther made this tremendous statement before one of the greatest theologians and spiritual princes of the Roman Church, the official representative of the pope, was as important and as innerly moving as that in which he later in Worms before kaiser and empire said: "I cannot otherwise. God help me. Amen." It is in such moments as these that the greatness of Luther looms up and the heroic qualities of the man. They explain the hold he has upon history, and especially the way he has ruled the northern Germans from that day to this.

*Köstlin, 5 Aufl. i. 207-9; text in Enders, *Luthers Briefw.* i. 249-61.

Faults big and little fall away, and the greatness of his soul in these crises times stand out to future generations like the pillars of Gibraltar.

On Thursday, the 14th, not much more was done. Cajetan spoke earnestly in the sense of the Thomist theology and thundered at Luther. He said the bull taught differently from Luther, pulled it out and read it loudly and scornfully. Luther still insisted that the treasure was not the merits of Christ, but the power of the keys acquired by those merits. The cardinal explained the Scripture differently, and, if we may trust to Luther's later memory, made the remark against the alone sufficiency of Scripture that Matthew himself erred in Matt. 27:9. It is enough, cried Cajetan, recant. While Luther declined this, he implored him to assure the pope of his good will. Cajetan replied that if Luther did not immediately comply with these demands or come to Rome to be judged, he would excommunicate him and all who are inclined toward him, as well as threaten an interdict, for he has a mandate for this from the pope. Then the cardinal arose and said: "Go, recant, or do not let me see you again."

It would seem that all was lost for Luther. But that same afternoon Cajetan called Staupitz and Link to him to get them to influence Luther. Nothing would be harmed if they could only get him to recant. Staupitz said it was impossible. He had himself urged him to submit to the Church; in learning and acuteness Luther is superior to me; perhaps Your High Worthiness could persuade him. This moved the cardinal badly, and according to a statement of Luther's friend Myconius, he answered in these oft quoted words: "I cannot speak further with this beast, for he has deep eyes and wonderful speculations in his head."† Finally the cardinal said he would let go Luther's views of faith if he recanted on the matter of indulgences, which brought later from Staupitz the bitter remark, that in Rome money matters more than

†Myconius, *Hist. Ref.* p. 73. See Schaff, vi. 174, note 1.

faith and salvation, because money is involved in the doctrine of the distribution of the merit of Christ. Cajetan told Link he would not bring Luther under the ban yet, but would wait further instructions from Rome, whither he had sent Luther's answer. The two monks reported soon after that they had worked upon Luther, who though humble, could not retract the main thing. On October 18th, Luther wrote to Cajetan a last letter which as never translated is given here.

Most Reverend Father in Christ:—Thy most Reverend Paternity has seen and known sufficiently my obedience, by which through such a journey and through so many dangers I, weak in body and most scanty in expenses, have brought myself here according to the mandate of our Most Holy Lord (Domini) Leo X, have appeared before thy Reverend Paternity, and have offered myself. I have laid myself and all my affairs at the feet of your Sanctity, expecting to receive whatever is seen (best), whether of condemnation or approval. And I am not conscious of omitting anything which pertains to an obedient son of the Church.

I am unwilling to use up time here in vain, nor am I able because means for expenses are lacking, and I may have been already sufficiently burdensome to these Carmelite fathers (the monastery where he had been entertained); especially when thy Reverend Paternity commanded me in a loud voice not to come back into thy presence if unwilling to recant. What to recant and how much I have shown in previous letters (in letters of October 14th, giving his long defense of the two points as to Clement's bull and as to faith, he says he is willing after all to yield to the Church on the first point, and in his letter of October 17th, he asks pardon for anything unwise or bitter he may have said, promises to abstain from speaking on indulgences if his enemies will abstain, and says he wishes only to follow the Church).

And so now I go away and depart to another place. And though it is proposed to me by those who as elders are able to move me that I should appeal from thy Most Reverend Paternity or rather from our most holy Lord Leo X badly informed to better informed (for I know that appealing rather than recanting would be more pleasing to our most Illustrious Prince [Frederick the Wise, the elector]), nevertheless I might not have appealed, either because the appeal might not seem necessary, or a contest in parts, when I might have referred everything to the judgment of the Church, and only waited for its judgment. For what ought I to do beyond or can do? For as accused and respondent I give heed not to what I say but to what the Church says, I am willing not to contend as an opponent, but to hear as a disciple.

Then I am almost persuaded that this cause is irksome to thy most Reverend Paternity and an appeal most grateful [so I shall appeal]; and as I do not merit, so I do not fear, censures, as I am so constituted by the grace of God that I fear censures less than errors and bad opinion in faith, because a censure does not injure, rather improves if right faith and a sense of truth are with me.

Therefore, I pray by the bowels of Christ and thy renowned clemency shown me to consider worthy this my distinguished and complete obedience hitherto, to commend me kindly to our most holy Lord, the pope, and consider favorably my departure and my appeal prepared for my necessity and by the authority of friends. For their voice and this reason was unconquerable: What will you recant? Would you hold up the law of faith for us by your recantation? Let the Church condemn first, if anything is to be condemned, and do thou follow her judgment and not she thine, and so I retire conquered. Valeat, etc.*

I have not space to give the contents of this Appellation.** Much later Luther said that if the cardinal had proceeded with him more moderately, things would not have gone so far; at that time he saw only a few errors of the pope; if the pope had kept still he would also have been silent; but it was the pope's custom to draw in on himself confused controversial questions and kill them; the pope would give a good deal now if it were still in the barrel where it was then*** Luther was mistaken here. Having gone so far he would inevitably have gone further.

A last question: How do you explain Luther's partial recantations, apologies, hesitations, eating humble pie, etc.? Remember, Luther and everybody else in western Europe was a Roman Catholic. He had no more intention of leaving his Church than of going to the moon. He never left her. To reverence the pope as the spiritual head of Christendom, and to stand in with the official doctrines of the Church, was a part of the universal consciousness of the time. Therefore, his attempts to clear himself, his painful efforts to keep in harmony as much

*De Wette, *Luthers Briefe*, i. 153-5; Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel* i. 266-8.

**See *Opp. var. arg.* 2. 397 and summary in Köstlin i. 212 (5 Aufl.).

****Colloquia*, ed. Bindseil, ii. 174f.

as possible with authorities. He wanted the Church cleansed from her corruptions and Germany saved from papal exploitations, but he wanted this as a devout Catholic. (By the end of this year he had rejected the claim that the Roman Church was superior to all other Churches, in which he certainly repudiated the orthodox view, and came around on this subject to Greek Catholicism. But he affirmed at the same time Rome's *de facto* supremacy over Germany.) He vainly thought his views were either in harmony with her true faith or tolerable as matters of opinion. This side of Luther (what we now might call his weak side) is not hard to explain. The miracle is not that, it is the heroic constancy with which he held on to the substance of what God had revealed until in its turn it became a part of the consciousness of a renewed Christian world.†

†For full account of the trial before Cajetan see the elaborate *Lives of Luther* by Köstlin, 5 Aufl. i. 188ff, esp. 201ff, Kolde, i. 189ff, Rade, i. 297ff, esp. 324ff (Rade's long 3 vol. Life has not the scientific apparatus in notes as Köstlin and Kolde, but it is a most excellent piece of work with long quotations from Luther, and is not so well known in America as it ought to be); the *Letters of Luther* in September and October, 1518, in De Wette vol. i. or Enders vol. i. the most valuable of which are translated by Dr. Preserved Smith in *Luther's Correspondence* i. 100ff and in his *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, pp. 47ff (both books must be used as letters generally do not duplicate); and Luther's *Acta Augustana* in Weim. ed, of his *Works* ii. 6ff; and the authorities referred to in Köstlin's notes.

OBJECTIVE RELIGION.

BY REV. J. E. WALTER, WEST NEWTON, PENNSYLVANIA.

Religion is both external and internal, or objective and subjective. It is objective in the body of principles or doctrines that it offers to the intelligence and faith of men. It is subjective as embracing the cognition, emotion, and volitional determination with which the doctrines are received by them. These two phases are necessary to one another, and constitute the unity and completeness of religion. There must be doctrines, including ethical statutes, to enlighten, to stimulate, to guide, to supply ideals; but they will be a dead letter if they are not known, appropriated and carried out in practice. The external teachings and the internal learning, trust and compliance must go together.

The primary fact of religion is the relation of man to God, and its chief doctrines pertain to this relation. Both the character of God and the character of man are concerned. The sources of doctrine are the Bible and natural revelation. The latter may be understood as including the extra-Biblical history and tradition of mankind. The Bible tells us of the attributes of God, of His supremacy as Creator, of His Fatherhood, of His moral laws and government, of Jesus the Saviour; and exhibits also the character of man, his dependence or inferiority as the child and moral subject of God, his moral needs. Nature and history reveal something of the character of God, something of His might and intelligence; and also His will towards men, especially by the evident conditions and laws of their existence and of their welfare individual and general.

The Bible is the supreme religious and moral history of mankind, and in it there is bequeathed to all races and generations of men an inestimable treasure of truth. It distinguishes itself markedly by the intrinsic and su-

perior excellence of its doctrines from all other records and alleged guides of the religious life of men. Its fundamental doctrines are of enduring value as having been ascertained and confirmed through the long ages of the life and discipline of the sons of God or the church of God—the primitive, Mosaic and Christian ages. Centuries of experience and training have not been void of lasting acquisitions.

An inspired volume is the Bible. Those who wrote it were influenced in a special manner by the Spirit of God. But their inspiration was not a gift apart from their general character. The prophets and apostles, as Isaiah and Paul, who indited these books were men of extraordinary character, in holiness, in energy of life, in rectitude of action; and were so in the midst of crooked and perverse generations. They were pre-eminent men of their ages, and of all ages. The same Spirit that raised them to this uncommon elevation of religious and moral character endowed them with a corresponding capacity for knowledge and revelation. The prophet's insight and discourse were a feature of his general spiritual exaltation.

In the primary religious and ethical teachings of these Scriptures we have an invaluable heritage of truth. They are the collected and compressed religious and moral acquisitions and wisdom of men through a long succession of centuries, as they were led and taught by God. They supply the clearest and fullest light upon the relation of God and men; they furnish the highest ideals of character, and the highest standard of action for the individual and for the community; they continue as ever to be "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." A recent eminent and ardent religious scholar has said encomiastically of the Bible: "What other book like this can awaken dumb or sleeping consciences, reveal the se-

cret needs of the soul, sharpen the thorn of sin and press its cruel point upon us, tear away our delusions, humiliate our pride, and disturb our false serenity? What sudden lightnings it shoots into the abysses of our hearts! What searchings of conscience are like those which we make by this light? It becomes a source of inward joy, a strength for life, and a hope which shines beyond death itself.”*

Of the fundamental, universal and lasting teachings of the Bible are those declaring the sinfulness of men; the justice, the love and placability of God; justification by faith, with the forgiveness of sins; the necessity of the new creation or new birth of the spirit; the great ethical principles of the sovereignty of God and the brotherhood of men.

Unequivocal proclamation of the sinfulness of men is made throughout the Bible, and with uniform emphasis. There will be no question as to the frequent and explicit affirmation of God's love and forgiveness in the New Testament; but even in the Old Testament they are frequently and forcibly declared: “Shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments” (Ex. 20:6); “I will hear what God the Lord will speak; for he will speak peace unto his people and to his saints: but let them not turn again to folly. Surely his salvation is nigh them that fear him” (Ps. 85:8). Justification by faith is a basal and perpetual principle of the Bible. Abel and Noah became heirs of the “righteousness of faith.” Abraham “believed in Jehovah; and he reckoned it to him for righteousness” (Gen. 15:6). The Psalms declare: “I sought Jehovah and he answered me, and delivered me from all my fears.” “Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile” (Pss. 34, 32). Jesus conserved and explicitly taught

*Sabatier, *Religions of Authority*, pp. 242, 243.

the same essential doctrine. He said to one: "Thy sins are forgiven ... Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace" (Luke 7:50). Again He said with emphasis: "He that believeth is not condemned (he is approved, justified); but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (Jno. 3:18). Paul followed Jesus in proclaiming, as a central truth of the gospel, that we are justified by faith; and illustrated and supported his teachings by special reference to the justification of Abraham. The necessity of a new creation or new birth of the soul is variously revealed in the Scriptures: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked" (Jer. 17:9); "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts" (31:33). The Psalmist prayed: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me ... Take not Thy holy Spirit from me" (Ps. 51:10). This petition and other like utterances seem to have been quite forgotten by Nicodemus; who was unable to understand Jesus, when He was teaching the indispensableness of such a spiritual re-formation as the Psalmist supplicated—"Ye must be born again (or from above)" (Jno. 3:7). The Two Great Commandments of the Old dispensation enjoining love to God and love to men are reaffirmed and re-established by Jesus, and made primary and permanent ethical statutes of His earthly kingdom. The prophets had taught, as Jesus, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men: "Are we not all the children of one Father? hath not one God created us?" (Mal. 2:10); "But now, O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our Potter. . . . We are all thy people" (Is. 64:8).

Yet the New Testament is certainly a great advancement upon the Old. It exhibits a marked development of doctrines. It supplements the Old with new revelations of the greatest importance. The conciliation or propitiation of God, which was before by special ways possible, is here

made to the fullest degree possible to all men, through the one great Sacrifice offered once for all; who "is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him." Justification by faith, which was indeed always a provision of God, is now rendered most definite and intelligible. Faith in God, ever the essential for justification, is here made faith in God as He is more vividly and perfectly revealed in His Son. So clearly and forcibly is the doctrine of justification by faith set forth in the New Testament, that it must be received as a fundamental and enduring principle of religion; and any form of religion that ignores or denies it, or degrades it from its historical eminence, must be deemed as so far not the Christian religion, but an alien cult. Life and immortality are brought gloriously to light in the gospel. Jesus reveals His conception of fulfilling the great commandments of love, by His own example: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45).

With the fundamental truths of the gospel have been established two special ordinances; namely, the Lord's Supper and Baptism (the immersion of believers). These two ordinances are so fashioned as to be vivid representations, pictures to the eye, of the two paramount facts of the earthly life of Jesus—His death and resurrection. It seems to have been the design of Jesus that these rites should go everywhere with the preaching of the gospel and be observed in remembrance of Him until He come; that they should show forth and keep forever lucid to the vision of men those two superlative facts, and be the modes of confessing faith in them.

There is with many theologians of this day a strong disposition to undervalue and considerably ignore the objective facts and doctrines of religion, especially the histories and dogmatic teachings of the Bible, in comparison with revelations of the subjective reason, or immediate impartations of truth by the immanent Spirit

of God. Many are saying: 'The articles of dogma are developed from the Christian consciousness'; 'Christian truth does not require objective support, but depends upon personal feelings and aspirations;' 'Our moral ideas are the work of our own Reason;' 'Christian truth is in God's revelation of Himself in man.'

Reason is made a special faculty or organ of religious and moral truth; yet its nature and functions are often obscurely conceived and defined. If it is supposed to be awakened or moved to production by external fact or truth, it is still regarded as in itself an original and rich source of truth. Reason is often imagined to be one, or to become one, with the Divine reason; and its conscious experiences or revelations to be communications of the Divine reason. Its real and sure knowledge comes not from outer revelation and objects, but from within itself, or from the Divine Spirit which is immanent or identical.

The human reason has, no doubt, important functions in the religious and moral life; but many earnest and eminent men have exalted it above proper measure. There is no sufficient ground for regarding reason or any faculty of the human mind as in itself a source of religious doctrine. The character and life and offices of Jesus as the Son of God and Saviour of the world are made known to us wholly by the transmitted history, and not by reason or any internal faculty. It is hard to see that we would have any of this truth, if we had not the historical accounts and were left to our subjective faculties alone. How dependent mankind are upon the external history and teaching is made clear to us by the Christianization of heathen peoples. That work is accomplished only by apostolic men who deliver to them in their own languages the Biblical messages.

There is no subjective faculty—reason, conscience, or other—which produces or originally issues moral law. But here we must carefully distinguish between moral

law as feeling, as the feeling of duty, and moral law as rule or statute. In fact no fully satisfactory general result can be reached in scientific morality without this discrimination. Moral law, as imperative feeling, is truly wholly subjective, is wholly of internal experience; but not moral law as norm or statute. The latter is apprehended by scientific empirical knowledge, considered in independence of Revelation; it is deduced by reason or intellect from the conditions of our existence and welfare and from the effect of actions or conduct. It is not a product of intellect, but rather the intellect's representation of objective fact and relation. As the intellect does not make external nature, so it does not make moral law; it only makes a representation of moral law. Intellect or reason has, as its primary office in morality, to cognize external reality, fact, law, as they exist in themselves and in their independence. Moral laws, in short, are, fundamentally, objective principles of human welfare, individual and general, and are scientifically cognized first as such. Yet, further, moral laws become fully known as moral, *i. e.*, are fully deduced or inferred scientifically from the conditions of our existence and well-being, and become fully felt as moral laws, when these conditions are understood as established by the Supreme Being. There can be no stable and prosperous community or State composed of liars. This is because of the conditions of communal existence and welfare as ordained by God. Therefore, Thou shalt not lie, or bear false witness, is a moral law.

It deserves remark that some Christian teachers have imagined that Jesus ascribed much higher value to subjective ethical law and ideal than to objective, or to the life guided by the former than to the life guided by the latter. They have said: "The perfectness of Christ's teaching is to be found, not in its completeness as a code, but in its emphasis upon the freedom from formal law."*

*Knox, *Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion*, p. 115.

Goodness of the Christian type is "loyalty to an ideal rather than submission to a code." "The good man . . . does not hark back to finished standards, but reaches forth to unfinished ideals."† One avers: "Jesus' aim always was to make good actions spring, not from submission to an external rule, but from an independent moral judgment in his disciples."

These assertions are strikingly at variance with the utterances of Jesus Himself. He said explicitly: "If ye love me, keep my commandments"; "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me" (Jno. 14:15, 21). And His commandments were to a very considerable extent the reaffirmation of the traditional Mosaic and prophetic moral laws. He desired that His disciples should keep His commandments, as He Himself kept His Father's commandments (Jno. 15:10). He said that His mother and brethren are those who hear the word of God and keep it (Luke 8:21). To the lawyer who asked what he should do to inherit eternal life, He answered in substance: Keep the supreme laws of God as read in the Scriptures (Luke 10:25). His avowed aim was, not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill. He added: "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Mt. 5:17-19). The two Scriptural statutes of love to God and love to neighbor He distinguishes as rising above all other religious and moral laws; "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (Mt. 22:40).

As far as the record goes, Jesus never gave one moment's consideration to any moral law or ideal of contemporary human origin or delivery. He never speaks of ideals that are over and above, in ethical significance, His express instructions and commands, and worthy to

†Faunce, *What Does Christianity Mean?* p. 126 and p. 124.

displace them. He proclaimed laws as Himself having authority over men. Altogether foreign to His thought is the supposition that subjection or submission to an external code, as the Decalogue and Beatitudes, is a thrall-dom, an unreasonable dependence, a going backward instead of going forward; and He never commends or promises freedom from His own and the traditional moral laws; He never declares, as Kant and his followers do, that to be truly free is to be autonomous. This is all alien to His mode of conception. He rather teaches, paradoxically, that if men will take upon themselves the yoke of His commandments, this burden and confinement, they shall then find rest and freedom; and His teaching is surely verified by the actual experience of men. Certainly Jesus never entertained, or showed the slightest favor towards, the view of many moralists, that objective law is not a deserving or commendable object of obligatory feeling and devotion; but only law or ideal of the subjective reason. What these men say cannot be, or should not be, or is of a low grade of service, Jesus requires unconditionally. As respects human moral autonomy, Jesus and Kant are manifestly antipodal to one another.

It is, however, not to be assumed that Jesus tacitly denied all exercise and efficiency to the subjective reason or conscience in the construction of ideals and in the independent apprehension of special moral laws. Reason has incontestably a great office in the formation of moral ideals, in the application of old laws to new situations, in the derivation of particular laws from general, in the improved and extended cognition of the conditions of human well-being, in the deduction of new moral laws; but it is impossible to point to any moral rule, law, or ideal divulged by modern human reason, that is superior to, or even co-ordinate with, the moral statutes for action and character made known to us by external revelation and tradition. The external commandments and exhortations

of Jesus respecting mercy, compassion, love, forgiveness, self-sacrifice, the greater blessedness of giving than of receiving, and of ministering to others than of being ministered unto, continue to this day, notwithstanding the important perceptions and issuances of reason, to be unquestionably the best instruction and incitement for the advancement of mankind in moral and also in physical well-being. Reason has always important labor and duty in developing moral ideals and the moral standard; but it has no ascendancy that gives it warrant for ignoring or disdaining the external moral tradition and constant dependence upon it.

Though Jesus enjoins with such explicitness and force the keeping of the external commandments, and seems to confine His view to them as being the supreme moral laws, He was certainly not indifferent to the internal emotions and purposes with which they should be kept. He expected and required men to revere them, and to practice them willingly and heartily.

While some have disparaged objective facts and doctrines in comparison with truth supplied by a high subjective faculty of man, reason or conscience, others have done the same, especially in comparison with supposed present immediate communications of truth from the indwelling Spirit of God. Many who particularly emphasize the indwelling Spirit of God as the source of knowledge or intuitions are unitarians. They hold that the Spirit of God is identical with the spirit of man, that human reason is a part and manifestation of the Divine Reason. They imply that man has immediate and certain knowledge of religious truth, because his reason, being one with the Divine Reason, immediately produces and possesses truth. "The Spirit of God," says Sabatier, "identifies itself with the human Me into which it enters and whose life it becomes. If we may so speak, it is individualized in the new moral personality which it creates."*

**Religions of Authority*, p. 307.

We must distinguish between immanence and identity. The Spirit of God is immanent in the soul of man, but is not one with it. There is distinction of personalities, or duality. This must be maintained because, for instance, of the decisive fact that we never have immediate knowledge of God. Our immediate knowledge does not transcend our distinct finite self. The knowledge of all else than self is not intuition or direct perception, but inference. There is an immediate knowledge of the effects produced in our soul by the Spirit of God, without immediate knowledge of the Spirit as the cause. A man has indeed near and assured, but not intuitive or direct, knowledge of the power of God, when, upon his own earnest supplication, he becomes conscious of emancipation from the tyranny of temptation and sin; just as he is conscious of a sensation produced in him by an external object, without immediate, but with only mediate, knowledge of the object itself.

There should be no question about the immediate influence of the Spirit of God upon the soul of man, by which it is illuminated, energized, and persuaded and convinced of truth. But this influence must be duly considered and estimated. There is no honor done to the Spirit of God by ascribing to Him more than He has actually performed or than the historical facts warrant. No well-established basis can be disclosed for believing that the objective doctrines and laws of the Christian revelation have ever been set aside, or disannulled, or rendered unnecessary, by the Spirit of God through direct inward revelation of truth. There can be shown no ethical law or ideal revealed by the Spirit since the ascension of Jesus that is of superior rank to those of Jesus set forth in the Gospels, and that supersedes them. The Spirit has always employed and honored the external traditional truth, and never given any indication of a tendency or purpose to displace it by inward communications of light and truth. The external truth has always been allowed to hold its

central position. It has not been set aside or left a useless guide, but rather has been confirmed for the believer by the blessed effects he is made to experience through love of it and through reliance and obedience.

One of the most ominous characteristics of the religious life of our time is the widely prevalent depreciation of doctrinal formulation or systematic theology. It discloses itself in frequent disparagement of creeds, in opposition to any degree of rigor in ecclesiastical doctrinal discipline and disfavor towards doctrinal exposition. You will hear men say, "Not a creed, but Christ."

But sober, earnest and penetrating thinkers depreciate the looseness and inconsistency of these and the like utterances. If Christ is to be for us anything more than a nebula, if He is to be a person of definite character and worth, then we cannot really have Him without having a creed or body of essential doctrines regarding Him. We should know whether He is human only, or both human and divine; what qualities He possesses that render Him a worthy object of love and worship; what there is in Himself, in His relation to God, and in His relation to men, that makes Him an adequate Redeemer. But if we know these attributes of Christ, we have a series and system of doctrines respecting Him, a creed. Further, in the proclamation of Christ as the Saviour, if the message is to come to anything, His qualifications as a Saviour must be set forth; or else it must be possible to preach Him on the presupposition that those qualifications are already generally known with some definiteness of knowledge, because of acquaintance with the Scriptural teachings.

Depreciation of creeds, or a systematic collection of religious doctrines, arises with some from the apparent belief that Christianity has no fundamental and perpetual principles; that it is subject to constant evolution and change, and that, therefore, none of its dogmas is to be accepted and revered as of indispensable and lasting importance. But we must contend that a religion without

definite and permanent principles can have no strong claim upon, and can make no strong plea to, intelligent minds; it cannot be of great consequence. This is not the character of the Christian religion. It undoubtedly has its primary and abiding dogmas.

The disparagement of the scientific elaboration of the doctrines of religion is based by some on the absence of such elaboration in the New Testament. It has been said: "If Christianity were creed, surely somewhere in the New Testament we should find a compact and convenient credal formula." "If correct credal statement and belief were central in Christianity, could Jesus have failed to leave behind Him some compendium of essential truth?"* Another has remarked: "Are you not struck with the fact that Jesus felt no concern to fix for the future the form of His discourses? It is as if He had feared in advance that some one might make a code of them like that of the Mosaic law."†

It is indeed true that the New Testament furnishes no complete systematic presentation of Christian truths, and it is not unreasonable to inquire why this should be so,—why Jesus did not write with His own hand or dictate, and make sure, by multiplied copies, of authentic transmission, a complete (if brief) and orderly and precise statement of the primary or essential articles of His teaching. It is not impious to ask such questions as these, but it is vain; for the human mind has no faculty or means of finding answers for them. There is nothing to do respecting these matters and others unrevealed, which we might like to know, but to submit humbly and reverently to the divine reserve and quiescence.

Yet no conclusion, from the absence of a strict systematic exhibition of His doctrines in the New Testament, could be more unsafe than that Jesus placed no value upon such an exhibition, and must view with indifference or disapprobation the effort and zeal of men to construct

*Faunce, *What Does Christianity Mean?* p. 29 and p. 42.

†Sabatier, *Religions of Authority*, p. 259.

as perfect a formulation of His teaching as possible. The lack of a compact and systematic statement of tenets no more proves that Jesus put but little value upon such a statement, than the fact that God never provided a systematic revelation of the principles of any natural science, proves that He regards the natural sciences as of small importance. Man is placed in the same condition respecting religious science as respecting natural. He is furnished in large measure with facts or elementary materials and principles; but the scientific formulation of them must be done by himself. He ought to have science, he was destined to have it, it is of great value, but he must construct it by his own exertions. It would have been probably of doubtful advantage to the human race to have been provided with the systematized formulation of facts and truths, and saved from all necessity of effort to accomplish it. The labors and delights of scientific research, discovery and organization seem to have been benevolently ordained as an important part of man's earthly discipline in both the religious and secular spheres.

So far as depreciation of or opposition to creeds or the collection of doctrines into exact systematic form goes, it can only result in the greatest injury to religion. It is a grave offense against its intellectual side. Scientific method has all the benefits for religion that it has for any interest or department of life. This is so because of the universal value of knowledge. Knowledge always leads in life. Men always in a progressive career feel and act because of what they know; and the fuller and the better organized the knowledge so much the better for regulation, vigor and success in action. Furthermore, the understanding and employment of scientific formulation of dogma is of the greatest worth to the acquisition and maintenance of intellectual vigor in the religious community. The prevalent disparagement of it discourages intellectual exertion and tends to the enfeeblement of the religious intellect. It encourages the dislike and evasion of mental effort, and is so far of the worst consequence.

THE ORIGIN OF EVIL.

W. P. WILKS, TH.D., CULLMAN, ALA.

“Πόθεν τὸ κακόν;”—“Whence (is) evil?” From their emergence till the present time both philosophy and religion have been confronted with this question. Evil is in the world. It must have had a beginning. When, however, we begin seeking some sure word concerning its ultimate origin we find as many different answers as there are systems of thought. A man’s theology largely determines his opinion here. Find what he thinks of God and you will not go far wrong in stating his theory of the origin of evil. Four general classifications of the theories are thus discovered: (1) Polytheistic conceptions; (2) Dualistic explanations; (3) The Monotheistic Problem; (4) Humanitarian theories.

1. POLYTHEISTIC CONCEPTIONS.

a. HEATHEN.

A glance at Greek theology here will be sufficient. Though Greek thought, Greek culture, and Greek customs varied greatly with time and place, Greek theology remained polytheistic. A vast assemblage of gods gathered in council on Olympus or scattered throughout the world to come in contact with men. From Father Zeus down there were all kinds of gods—big gods, little gods; gods powerful, gods puny, bad gods, gods good in a sense; male gods, female gods; gods of the heavens, of the waters, of the earth, and under the earth. They delighted in playing all manner of pranks on one another and working mischief among men. Even the unmentionable crimes are unblushingly ascribed to some of them. Make the gods evil and evil must follow among men. By way of the gods, therefore, did evil come into the world, according to the Greek conception.

b. GNOSTIC.*

From the days of John "the beloved" until crushed by the sledge-hammer blows of Irenæus this variation of the Greek conception powerfully influenced Christian thinking. Many types of belief existed among the Gnostics, yet they reached common ground in their thinking with regard to the origin of evil in the world. God is good. No imputation of the origin of evil to Him is permissible. But evil is in the world. It must have come from some source. This source cannot be found by them in the many minded gods of the Greeks. But there is something else besides God in the universe. Matter is here and must be accounted for in some way. Since God is good, matter must be evil. Then it follows that God did not create matter; hence, matter must be as eternal as God. Being evil, matter is responsible for evil being in the world. But a problem yet remained: How did good and evil come to be mixed, as we find them? The answer is this: At the head of all the divine beings is one god, called different names by the various sects of Gnostics. This Bythus, or Propator (or whatever other name they chose to call him), with, or without, a consort (this depending on the sect of Gnostics), produced two æons. These produced another pair, and they, in turn, others. Down the long line of æons thus produced one transgressed. Here there are multitudinous theories of how contact with matter was effected, but all agree that it was brought about. From this contact there issued a world of mixed good and evil.

2. DUALISTIC EXPLANATIONS.

a. THE PERSIAN DUALISM.

A study of this system must center around Zoroaster. As early as the time of Plato he was considered a Persian,

*See the five books of Irenæus on "A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge Falsely So-Called." English translation in the "Ante-Nicene Fathers," under title "Against Heresies."

but we cannot be sure with regard to the place of his birth. Concerning the date at which he lived there is a wide divergence of opinions. Hemippus of Smyrna places him five thousand years before the Trojan war, while some modern scholars have brought the date of his birth down as late as 633 B. C.

The doctrine of Zoroaster is that of an eternity-long conflict between good and evil. There originally existed two spirits—Ormuzd and Ahriman—who represented good and evil, each having creative powers. In an old Persian Psalm, we read, “I proclaim the two original spirits of the world—the one bountiful, the other wicked,—two twins, each having his own qualities—the one good, the other bad, in thought, in word and action.”* All created things owe their origin to one or the other of these; man being created by Ormuzd (the good god), but with free will, thus able to choose between good and evil. Ahriman invaded the realm of Ormuzd, who proposed peace and offered to let Ahriman help with the good creation. This he refused, saying, “I will not join thee in doing good, but will seduce thy creatures to myself.”** He then set himself to the task and induced the “senseless” to follow him, but the wise chose aright.

An interesting side-light on this form of dualism is the existence to our own times of the Yezidis, or “Devil-Worshippers.” A. V. W. Jackson estimates that there are several hundred of these in the immediate vicinity of Tiflis, with twelve thousand in all the region of the Caucasus. While recognizing the existence of another Being, they reverence Satan as the one who can now work evil to humanity, and believe that he will be restored so as to

*See Gathas, XXX of Yaswa; also “The Story of Persia,” by Mme. Z. A. Ragozin.

**See “The Religion of Persia,” by John Milne; Art. on “Oriental Paganism,” in “The Religions before Christ,” by Edmond de Pressensé; Art. “Persia,” in “Oriental Religions,” by Samuel Johnson.

**†In “Persia, Past and Present.”

have power to reward those who are faithful to him.***
“Will not Satan then reward the poor Yezidis who alone have never spoken ill of him?” is said to have been asked of a German traveler by an aged Devil-Worshiper. It is asserted that they sacrifice one sheep to Christ each year—and thirty to the Devil.

b. THE THEORY OF MARCION.

Although often classed with Gnostics, Marcion held very little in common with that heresy. From the middle of the second century of our era, when he became prominent, until now, his name has been anathematized. Polycarp is said to have once met Marcion in the streets of Rome and to have saluted him as “the firstborn of Satan.” Concerning his teachings, Tertullian says, “The true Prometheus, Almighty God, is mangled by Marcion’s blasphemies.”† Laying prejudice aside, however, one can but admire Marcion as an earnest seeker after truth and righteousness. Having been converted from heathen views, he sought a higher type of spiritual life than was manifested by the orthodox Christians of his time. In Christ he found that ideal, and in His teachings (i. e., such of them as he chose to consider original) the very things which he felt God would make known to men. The Christians of his time, being now much enamored of Judaism, laid great stress upon the Old Testament. Marcion read this also—and found many things which seemed to him not only contrary to the teachings of Christ but far below any true standard of morals. Having no one at his side to explain these for him—as was later done so admirably by Tertullian—he came to the conclusion that the two

***See “Nineveh, and Its Remains,” by Austen Henry Layard, p. 246.

†Tertullian “Against Marcion,” Bk. 1, Ch. 1. The five books of Tertullian against Marcion must be read to gain an understanding of his doctrine.

Testaments could not have received their inspiration from the same source. Since so much lower standard is found in the Old Testament than in the New, Marcion decided that it was not only inspired by a different God but that the two gods are in opposition. The God of the New Testament is seeking to establish a kingdom of righteousness in the world, while the god of the Old Testament is endeavoring to hinder Him from carrying to completion this benevolent design. For this purpose the god of the Old Testament introduced evil into the world, not merely permitting but bringing about the fall of man.

3. THE MONOTHEISTIC PROBLEM.

It is with forethought that the word "problem" is used here. Although the human mind is more content with the unity reached in the monotheistic conception, and though many of the problems of the universe are more satisfactorily explained thereby, it offers the least adequate explanation of the origin of evil. Given an omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent God, holy in His nature, and it becomes practically impossible to account for the origin of evil. A study of the bunglesome and sometimes almost ludicrous explanations found in the different orthodox creeds will convince one of the difficulty existing just here.

Before taking up the discussion of these attempted solutions, though, it is well to consider the teaching of the Bible itself. The narrative in Genesis (ch. 3) describes the advent of evil into the life of humanity. "The serpent" is said to be the agent in tempting the woman to disobey God. This serpent is given such qualities as no earthly creature has since been found to possess. He was "more subtle than any beast of the field which Yaweh God had made." The ability to communicate thought through the medium of words was his. He placed himself in opposition to the announced will of God concerning man, and seduced man to disobey his Maker.

But man is not freed from guilt thereby. He used his own volition, hence was responsible for the fall and for the evils attendant thereupon. The serpent was responsible; so, also, was man. But we have here only the beginning of evil in the world. Whence came the agent to seduce man? The presumption is that God created him—"for without Him did not anything come to be which is."^{*} And yet we are nowhere definitely told that the serpent owed his existence to God. If we take that graphic account of a war in heaven given us by John ^{**} to mean that Satan was once an angel, and had lost his estate through disobedience, we have not yet reached the ultimate origin of evil. It must have been in existence prior to that, else Satan could not have chosen it, nor have been tempted thereto. So we must, however reluctantly, confess that no clear message with regard to the ultimate origin of evil is given us by the Bible. We are only told how it entered this world.

As Christianity became more theoretical the tendency grew towards stating its different doctrines in dogmatic terms. Beginning with short statements of belief, or principles, there were gradually evolved the longer creeds. Men were called upon to accept these statements *in toto*, or else be anathematized. One of the problems was that with which we are dealing. The orthodox statements deal with three stages of the origin of evil. We consider them inversely to their chronological order, for reasons which are obvious.

a. The origin of evil in post-Edenic individuals.

The theory of *original sin* is supposed to give the sufficient answer here. The fall of Adam and Eve involved all their posterity in such a way that the whole of humanity, and the whole of every individual, is depraved. Additional investigation is needless, if we but accept such statements as these: "They (Adam and Eve) being

^{*}John 1:3.

^{**}Revelation 12:7ff.

the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.”*** “If any one asserts that the prevarication of Adam injured himself alone, and not his posterity . . . let him be anathema.”**** “We believe that all the posterity of Adam is in bondage to original sin, which is an hereditary evil.”* Such is the tenor of all the confessions and creeds of this trend of theological thought. Not merely is there a bias towards the choice of evil but the act of Adam and Eve is so imputed to their posterity that all are sinners on that account.**

b. The entrance of evil into the world.

The simple story of Genesis (ch. 3) is generally accepted in all these creeds and confessions.

c. The ultimate origin of evil.

The consistent outcome of this system of theological thought is to put the final responsibility for evil upon God. The all-inclusive doctrine of predestination affirmed makes any other conclusion inconsistent. “God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass. . . . By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and un-

***Westminster Confession of Faith (1647).

****Declaration of the Council of Trent (Jan. 17, 1546).

*French Confession (1559).

**“Augustine, in fact, framed the conception of original sin in order to uphold the sacramental character of infant baptism, in other words, as an inference from the special worth of this instrument of the Divine revelation of salvation”—Albrecht Ritschl, p. 329, “Justification and Reconciliation,” 3d. Ed., trans. by H. R. McIntosh and A. B. Macauley.

changeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.”*** “We believe that God rules and governs them (all things), according to His holy will, so that nothing happens in this world without His appointment.”**** In practically the same words do the other creeds and confessions of this system set forth the same doctrine. The predestination is so inclusive that no act of man or angel is left to the free will of the one who performs it. The Westminster Confession adds this negation, “Yet, so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures,” and the Belgic this, “nevertheless, God neither is the author of, nor can be charged with, the sins that are committed.” All these attempted negations prove is that the framers of the articles saw where the doctrine must inevitably lead. If the negation be true, the preceding statement must be false. That this was recognized is shown by the fact that not one of the confessions even undertakes to show how God could unalterably decree the evil deeds committed by men without Himself being the Author of the deeds decreed. Thus, instead of explaining the problem, such theories make the confusion all the more confounded.

5. Humanitarian Theories.*

Over against the different conceptions with which we have been dealing there have not been wanting, from early times until now, those who seek to find the full explanation of evil within humanity itself. This does not necessarily mean that God is excluded from their thinking, though the general tendency among them is to fol-

***Westminster C. of F.

****Belgic Confessoin (1561).

*It will be understood, without elaboration, that the word “Humanitarian” as here used refers not to the technical term as applied to anti-Trinitarianism but to its more inherent sense of finding the sufficient explanation within humanity itself.

low the advice said to have been given by Confucius, "Respect the gods! but have as little as possible to do with them."

a. Buddhism** says, "It seems that when men and women first came into the world, sin appeared not to have been in them, as covetousness, anger, and stupidity; afterwards those things gradually increased in them, in consequence of which they began to commit sinful acts." Instead of an evil spirit, or spirits, seducing human beings to choose evil, the choice of evil by human beings is responsible for the existence of devils: 'Devils were human beings, and, on account of their horrible sins, did fall from this state of happiness; but their having been good, or fallen angels, or having been created, or existing from eternity is denied.' Again, "The devil and other powerful spirits do not cause sin." Here we have a purely humanitarian conception of sin, God's existence or non-existence having no connection therewith.

b. Arminian Theology.

In its insistence on the freedom of the human will, the Arminian theology has placed the burden of the responsibility for the fall of our first parents and for the choice of evil by all their posterity upon humanity. God did not decree the fall. So far as the fall, or our choice of evil, is concerned, God is not needed at all. Had He stepped aside from the affairs of the world after creating it the result would have been the same, in this matter at least. The fall of Adam and Eve involved only themselves. Our choice is our own. "This one God created man, good (a), according to His likeness (b), for salvation or safety, and in him all for the same happy end (c). The first man fell into sin (d) and became subject to divine wrath, and by God was raised up again through consolatory promises (e) and admitted to eternal life at the same time with all those that had fallen (f); so that

**See "Sacred Books of Ceylon," containing many translations from tracts, catechisms, etc., from the Singhalese by Edward Upham.

none of his posterity, in respect of restitution, is born guilty of sin or blame (g).”*** “... .. None of his (Adam’s) posterity are guilty, sinful, or born in original sin.” ****

With regard to the ultimate origin of evil Arminian theology has no message. The exercise of free will is as far as it can go.

c. Modernist Explanations.

Within the last one hundred years three factors have contributed to placing the emphasis upon the humanitarian conception. (1) In the scientific world the evolutionary theory, with its variations, has had no small part in re-shaping the religious thinking of many. Here is a great system of thought which, while not seeking to displace God altogether, undertakes to explain many of the phenomena formerly attributed to the direct intervention of Providence. Through its teachings of the survival of the fittest man is not only made the architect of his own life but is largely led into self-centered ideas of his own part in the struggle for existence. (2) The revolt against authority which has been in progress in politics and religion has contributed greatly to the same result. In the realm of religion, men have revolted against the former insistence on the authority of the Church, or of any church, and against the assertion of authority of creeds. The anathemas of church and creed alike are no longer feared. Experimental values in religion have been greatly stressed. This revolt against authority has not stopped here with many, but has seriously called into question the authority of the Bible itself. Only man and God are left—and God must not assert an authority displeasing to man. “Reason is the unimpeachable judge in all questions pertaining to

***Mennonite Confession (1580).

****Short confession of faith of English Baptists (c. 1611).

the true and the false, the good and the bad".* (3) The emphasis placed upon social obligations is the third factor. Here the welfare of humanity is the *summum bonum*. The social consciousness would usurp the attention. Let us note briefly some of the developments from these causes:

(1) Ritschlianism.

Albrecht Ritschl (1822-89) has exercised a wonderful influence on the thinking of the last century. This has not been confined by any means to those who have belonged to the so-called "Ritschlian School." Making man and his spiritual needs the aim of his study, he could but revolt against the idea of external authority advanced by Protestant Churches, as well as by the Catholics. The scientific world was in the throes of revolution. Darwin, being not quite a decade and a half his elder, was beginning to create a great commotion, which was increasingly felt by the successors to Ritschl. To evolution and to Ritschlianism alike a fall is not required. Indeed in-so-far as the origin of evil is concerned no God is needed. Negatively, Ritschlianism says, (a) There was no original ethical bond between God and man. (b) There is no necessity for the imputation of essential righteousness to God; even declaring that such is "not metaphysical." (c) The theory of original sin is repudiated, this being termed an absurdity. (d) The necessity of sin being committed by each individual is denied. (e) It is not true to say that the evils which befall us are penalties for sin. Positively: (a) Sin is an interference with the kingdom God is seeking to establish in the world. (b) Sin is due to ignorance on the part of man. If man knew better he would do better. (c) Man starts as a natural being, the subject of self-seeking desires. (d) Sin originates in the will, and consists in acts of the will. (e) Sin is progressive. Children, not being born with any bias towards

*"The Finality of the Christian Religion," by George Burnam Foster, 2d Edition, p. 196.

sin, ignorantly perform a wrong act. This act repeated issues in habit, and habits result in the formation of character. This conclusion must follow: The origin of evil (*i. e.* so far as Ritschlianism knows of its origin) lies in the will of man and is due to ignorance on the part of man.**

(2) The New Theology.***

This is written after the writer of the book from which quotations are given has become so dissatisfied with his own utterances that he has declared his disbelief therein. The purpose in now setting it forth is simply to show the limit to which a purely humanitarian view may lead one.

In this abortive volume there is an arrogance of assertion which fills with astonishment any man who has faith in God and believes in the teachings of the Bible. Approaching the problem of evil, he says, "It is still the fashion to declare this problem insoluble, but I have the audacity to believe that it is not so I will even go so far as to assert that the problem had been solved in human thought before Christianity began" (p. 43). He then proceeds to define evil as "a negative, not a positive term. It denotes the absence rather than the presence of something. It is the perceived privation of good, the shadow where the light ought to be" (p. 43). That evil is a necessity is a further assumption: "Instead of asking how evil came to be in the universe, we should recognize that nothing finite can exist without it" (p. 44). "In our present state of existence evil is necessary in order that we may know that there is such a thing as good, and therefore that we may realize the true nature

**"Justification and Reconciliation," by Albrecht Ritschl; 3d Edition, English translation, by H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay. See statements on pages 330, 331, 332, 334, 348, 349, 350, 351, 353, 384. See "The Ritschlian Theology," by Alfred E. Garvie; also, "Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith," by James Orr, and "Ritschlianism," by the same author.

***"The New Theology," R. J. Campbell.

of life eternal" (p. 44). The story of the fall is called "The Genesis myth about Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden" (p. 55. See, also, p. 53). And again, on page 55, "What I now wish to insist upon is that it is absolutely impossible for any intelligent man to continue to believe in the Fall as it is literally understood and taught." Once more, "We take leave of our common sense when we talk

'Of man's disobedience and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree.'" (p. 59)

Then the author proceeds to set forth his theory that what little truth there is underneath the doctrine of the fall shows that "this fall has no sinister antecedents; its purpose is good, and there is nothing to mourn over except our own slowness at getting into line with the cosmic purpose" (p. 66). Then note this conclusion, "Even the sinful life is a quest after God, although it does not know itself to be such, for in seeking life saint and sinner alike are seeking God, the all-embracing life ... The good man and the bad man are seeking the same thing in opposite ways" (pp. 145-146). "That drunken debauch was a quest for life, a quest for God . . . "That 'roue' you saw in Piccadilly last night, who went out to corrupt innocence and to wallow in filthiness of the flesh, was engaged in this blundering quest for God" (pp. 150-151). Thus do we find the "New Theology" excusing evil and seeking to show that sin is nothing but a blunder, a mistake, a quest after God (pp. 52, 145, 146, 150, 151, 158, 161). No attempt is made to trace the origin of evil beyond humanity, except that it is "only the perceived privation of what you know to be good, and which you know to be good because of the very presence of limitation, hindrance, and imperfection" (p. 45).

(3) Eddyism.

* So-called "Christian Science" would go one step further and do away altogether with the existence of

* "Rudimental Divine Science," by Mary Baker Eddy—pp. 4, 5, 10, 11.

evil. While the authoress of the different handbooks of this cult writes of evil, she denies its reality. Take such assertions as these: "God is infinite Mind, hence there is no other Mind. ... All is Mind. According to the Scriptures and Christian Science, all is God, and there is naught beside Him. ... If, as the Scriptures imply, God is All-in-all, then all must be Mind, since God is Mind. ... Mortal ills are but errors of thought. ... What seems to be disease, vice, and mortality are illusions of the physical senses. These illusions are not real, but unreal."** In another of her handbooks*** we find these assertions, "Matter, or evil, is the absence of the spirit or Good. Their nothingness is thus proven; for God is good, ever present, and All ... As mortals, we need to discern and to fight these claims, not as realities, but as illusions. ... There was never a moment in which evil was real." God is not only not the author of evil but He knows nothing of it—"If God knows evil, even as a false claim, this knowledge would manifest evil in Him and proceeding from Him." From this it is seen that evil is merely a figment of the human imagination, thus having no real origin other than the illusions of the physical senses, according to the teachings of the late Mrs. Eddy.

Having now noted in detail these different offered explanations of the origin of evil, the following conclusions seem fully warranted:

First; We are, at least, as far from a solution of the problem as when we began. In our search for some sure word of truth in answer to our question, we find ourselves not unlike Coleridge's sailors when there was

"Water, water, every where,
And all the boards did shrink;
Water, water, every where,
Nor any drop to drink."

**"No and Yes," by the same author—pp. 17, 23, 24. See p. 32.

***Id, p. 16. See also p. 17.

Theories of the origin of evil abound every where, but the earnest seeker fails to find the truth which he desires. We end as we began, by still asking, "Πόθεν τὸ κακόν;"

Secondly, That teaching which portrays the reality of evil in its most alarming proportions yet attempts no explanation of its ultimate origin is, on the whole, the most satisfying. Those who have set forth polytheistic theories show that even their minds seek an ultimate unity, for each system has its one god at the head of the other gods. The dualist reveals the same desire for ultimate unity by teaching the final triumph of the good god and the accompanying overthrow, or restoration, of his opponent. The fatalistic conceptions of monotheism are so filled with easily apparent contradictions whenever they attempt to trace the origin of evil beyond Eden that one cannot rest with them. Experience teaches that the untrammelled freedom of the human will, as taught by the Buddhist and the Arminian, is not true. Ritchlianism, while emphasizing to an extreme experiential values, fails to take into consideration the full contents of experience itself. Moreover, if sinful acts be due to ignorance it would follow that the committing of evil deeds would be in proportion to the education possessed by different individuals; which is not even approximately true. That the "New Theology" fails to satisfy is sufficiently demonstrated by its recantation on the part of its former most prominent advocate, to say nothing of the violence done to experience by such assertions as it makes. Eddyism denies that which even itself takes into account. Negations can never suffice for those who really think. When these various attempts to solve the problem have been considered one turns with a greater relish to the simplicity and frankness of the Bible method in dealing with the entire problem of evil. We become more content with not knowing that which is left outside the light thrown upon the problem by Divine Revelation.

Finally; We ask ourselves, Is it necessary to know? Would evil be any the more easily overcome or eternal life more readily reached by understanding where and how evil originated? From pragmatic considerations, we are forced to decide that the revelation we have is all that we really need. One spring recently there was a wide breach made in a levee holding the waters of the Mississippi river in its banks. Thousands of acres of land were inundated, numerous families left homeless, and several lives lost. The problem of the state and national governments was not to discover from what fountain, or cloud, or melting snow-bank came the first drop of water that trickled through the levee; but to rescue the people who were in danger, provide for their needs, and undertake to reclaim the flooded land by confining the waters anew to their proper course. Not many nights have passed since the writer was aroused from sleep by the ringing of a fire-bell. On looking from the bedroom window, flames leaping into the air from a residence were beheld. Other houses were endangered from the fire. The neighbors and the firemen hastened thither. The problem to which they gave their attention was not to discover what factory produced the match from which the fire originated; but to gain control of the fire, carry to a safe distance what household goods they could, and to keep the flames from spreading to other buildings. Did the governments pursue the wisest course in dealing with the flood situation? Did the firemen and neighbors with the fire? The Bible follows the same plan in dealing with the problem which we have before us. Evil is in the world, endangering the whole of humanity. Very wisely did the God revealed in the Bible choose not to tell us whence it originated but how to escape the destruction upon which it is bent.

MORAL DIFFICULTIES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By W. C. TAYLOR, D.D., CLARKSBURG, W. VA.

It must be borne in mind that not everything related in the Old Testament is claimed to be morally right. Many things are recorded as incidental to the general depravity of the times to which they belonged that lay no claim to divine sanction, as cases of incest, adulteries and polygamy. But the thoughtful student will find the divine estimate of these things in the sequel. Read the story to the end. Judge the tree by its fruits. The heart-aches of Abraham, the troubled life of Jacob, of David and Solomon can be traced back to their plural marriages and in the light of the sequel we find that polygamy is wrong.

Again; some things are recorded of men called of God that are palpably wrong but in which God had no part, as Saul's furious purpose to slay Jonathon (I. Samuel 14); the sacrifice of Jephtha's daughter in the eleventh of Judges. Many facts like these are part of the Scriptures which illustrate the moral darkness of the times and which were to disappear in the clearer conceptions of the divine righteousness.

The aim of this paper is to notice the more prominent moral difficulties of the Old Testament and to arrive at some principle by which they may be accepted in accord with an enlightened conscience. But as the conscientiousness of no two is the same, it may be taken for granted that the moral standard of our Lord Jesus Christ will suffice for all. The problem, then, resolves itself to this; namely, Does the revelation that God has made of Himself in the Old Testament accord in principle with the revelation which He has made of Himself through the Lord Jesus?

The first difficulty that troubles some minds is that of the curse pronounced upon our first parents in the Garden of Eden on account of their sin. Was that sen-

tence just! Nothing is gained by saying that the Eden story is an allegory. The morals are the same, however we may take the narrative.

To get at an answer to this question let us consider, first of all, that man was created with the powers of intelligence, moral discrimination and moral choice. Nothing was lacking to render him competent to live in perfect accord with the divine will. Then let us remember that intelligently and purposely he disobeyed that divine will. In doing that he showed clearly that he doubted the goodness of God in limiting the gratification of desire; the truth of God which foretold the consequences of sin, and that he defied the displeasure of God and took all the risk of the consequences of his disobedience upon himself. It was the first instance in the long history of human sin, the like of which is repeated in every sinner's life, in which unbelief, arrogance, self-will and unrestrained impulses arose against the will of the supreme God. As to the justice of the curse there are two answers. One is that every sin carries its own penalty. Transgression and retribution are linked as cause and effect. They are inseparable. No candid man who admits his sins ever charges God with injustice or unkindness on account of the penalties that follow his transgressions, nor did Adam do so. And the other answer is, that, in view of Adam's moral intelligence and conscience, what reads as a sentence of doom now changes color and appears as an announcement of sin's inevitable consequences in view of the promise of redemption which was to follow. The pronouncement of the curse prepared the way for the announcement of redemption. The one was necessary to the other and remains so through the ages. Conviction of sin under the law must ever precede redemption from sin under the gospel. Only the man that finds himself a sinner can appreciate Jesus Christ as a Saviour. The Spirit that pronounced the curse upon our first parents in Eden in view of the coming promise of the way of their

redemption, through the Seed of the Woman, is the same that was in Jesus when He rebuked the sins of the Pharisees and then pointed them to Himself as the Way of life. The spirit of the curse and the promise in Eden appear again at the cross where we see the wrath of God against sin blent with the love of God for sinners. The message of Calvary came to Eden and the message of Eden was fulfilled on Calvary. To blot out either is to admit the other. The justice of God proclaimed to our first parents is exactly the same that was proclaimed and fulfilled by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The Deluge. To some the record of the deluge reads as that of an outrage. We might reply that the like has often occurred during succeeding ages and no moral difficulty was awakened. Volcanic eruptions, storms, earthquakes and floods have many times destroyed possibly as many as lived in Noah's day. This does not settle the moral difficulty of the deluge but it does show that occasions for the like of it may arise at any time concerning which no question is raised. But let us get back to the principles underlying God's purposes in creation and redemption. This is God's world. He made it right. It was made for the abode of righteousness and love. There is nothing wrong in this world except sin and there is no sin without a sinner. As a matter of simple justice, the sinner, as such, has no right to be in this world. He is here by a divine grace. It may be objected that no man is here by his own choice; granted, but still it remains true that every sinner is such by his own choice and that the choice is made in defiance of the light of reason, justice and the divine love. Now take a race of sinners, such as were the antediluvians. The picture is drawn with few strokes but they are bold and black. The stream of human history had not proceeded far but it was flowing with prodigious energy and was deep and dark with the curse of sin. Crime had grown to colossal proportions. "There were giants in those days." Take a Nero or a

Borgia, endow him with the strength of a Samson and the intellect of a Julius Cæsar, give him a lifetime of four or five hundred years for violence and blood; fill the earth with a race of such monsters, with their breed continually multiplying; then recognize the fact that after one hundred and twenty years of patience and grace on the part of God they still resisted every claim of righteousness; and, grant once more that God's purpose was to perpetuate on the earth a race that would render Him due homage and obedience, then, what other course would the simplest wisdom suggest than that of the flood or its equivalent? It is just that patriotism should destroy the traitor; that trade should bring to naught the embezzler and forger; that there are sins against social purity that social purity can not condone; then, shall man be accorded a sense of justice and the rights of self-protection denied to God?

If true manhood shows itself in vindicating personal honor and in protecting personal rights, shall the sovereign God cancel His eternal purpose, abdicate His throne and retire from His own universe that a race of rebels may reign? However monstrous such a course as that of a destroying flood may appear, in view of God's holiness and purpose, it was inevitable. May we not say that similar methods of procedure are still continued? May not the time come when devout hearts will declare that the hand that wiped Spanish tyranny from this hemisphere of democracy was divine? As we read how that France, Germany and England are turning back to the worship of God, that their churches are filled with worshippers as they have not been for generations, may it not be said that in this terrible war God is removing some things from this earth forevermore, that have hindered the incoming of the kingdom of righteousness and brotherly love? The retribution of annihilation, on account of unbelief, that came to the antediluvians is exactly what our Lord foretold would come, for the same reason, to

Jerusalem and the cities of the Galilean Lake. If there be moral difficulties by the flood we find them again in the messages of Jesus.

And this leads us to consider other difficulties still more serious; namely, the indiscriminate slaughter and extermination of the tribes of Canaan during the early occupation of the children of Israel. That slaughter was to be complete. Helpless women and children were to be put to the sword without mercy and no one was to be spared. God ordered it so. The record of those butcheries would not be so unutterably shocking were it not declared that they were ordered of God. Now what?

Before attempting an answer, let it always be kept in mind that the most insidious hindrance to a clear apprehension of truth and of the divine purpose, is that of our sentimental feelings. Sentiment has shorn away the Samson-like locks of many a doctrine of grace and put out the eyes to many a divine truth which, otherwise, would vitalize the soul with the power of settled conviction and heroic purpose. The Bible was not inspired by sentiment nor was it penned by sentimentalists. Its matter is truth, sometimes beautiful, sweet and full of comfort, but often stern and severe as the crags of the rock-ribbed mountains. Concerning the Land of Promise, it is clear, as all will admit, that it was God's purpose to use it for working out a scheme, if you please, for the world's redemption. That required the care and special preparation of a special people. That people was the Hebrew race. For forty years they were undergoing part of that preparation in their wilderness experiences under the tutelage of Moses. During that time the tribes in Israel had knowledge of their purpose to enter the land and that they were coming in obedience to their God. They had evidence that He was a living God, and no dead idol, who had definite meanings in His plans and a definite end in view. Put along with this the fact, that being a nomadic people, they had ample time to withdraw from the land

had they so chosen. The record of their filthy licentiousness, their heathenish worship, their raids and butcheries is well known to all who are familiar with the story of the first five hundred years of the Hebrew occupation. The tendency of Israel towards these heathenish practices is also clearly indicated. Now, to have spared those tribes of Canaan to marry and to intermarry with the Hebrews, or to multiply their mongrel breed without any marriage at all,—that would have secured the moral ruin of Israel and would have blotted moral cleanness from the face of the earth and would have brought the human race again to where it was before the flood. In that case we should have no Bible, no divine light, no divine life, no Christ, no atonement for sin, no hope.

To some, the fact of the sovereignty of God's purpose working out His plan of redemption for our lost race, may not be satisfactory. The question still comes up, Was His method with the Canaanites just? The justice of it all comes into clearer light when we see that God did not touch the Canaanites until the cup of their iniquities was full and their last tendency towards righteousness had perished. Let it be remembered that regardless of their lessons learned from Moses and Joshua, from the Judges and Samuel, the Amalekites, for more than five hundred years, continued to be the inveterate enemies of Israel and of Israel's God. With that in mind and in view of the divine purposes for which Canaan had been reserved of God in a way that no others than the Hebrews ever felt that it was theirs, then to what conclusion can we come, other than to this, that if God be a God of holiness, who will keep His covenant and provide a way of redemption, the total extermination of the tribes of Canaan, filthy, hostile and irreconcilable, should be accomplished? Dr. Thomas Arnold, whom no one will accuse of having narrow views of the scriptures, says: "*It is better that the wicked should be destroyed a thousand times over than that they should tempt those to join their company who*

are as yet innocent. Let us think what might have been our fate and the fate of every other nation on the earth had the sword of the Israelites done its work more sparingly. Even as it was, the small portion of the Canaanites that was left, and the nations around them, so tempted the Israelites by their idolatrous practices that we read of the whole people of God turning away at last from His service. The Israelites fought not for themselves alone but also for us. They preserved unhurt the seed of eternal life and were the ministers of blessing to all other nations, even though they themselves failed to enjoy it." What a startling testimony, this, to the justice and mercy of God;—justice in that sinners who oppose the sovereign purpose of a holy God will be destroyed, and mercy that in spite of the ingratitude and unbelief of rebellious man, God will keep His covenant to work out a way of salvation for all who seek the ways of righteousness.

The last difficulty that shall claim our attention is that of the imprecatory Psalms, such as Psalms VII, XXXV, LXIX, and CIX. They are generally accepted as Psalms of David. There is much to support that opinion. They voice much that was evidently part of intense personal experience and at the same time proclaim, with the conviction of a prophet, the unchanging principles of an eternal righteousness. In each of them the burden of the petition is that God will avenge His servant of his enemies and bring their devices to naught. But notice their temper. It is not that the petitioner may, himself, be the avenger; there is no personal resentfulness, nor is there a cry for redress for personal loss. In each of these psalms the appeal is for retribution to come upon them that hate and oppose and hinder one who is striving to be the servant of Jehovah. The imprecations are against those who are enemies of his soul, his religion and his God. And at the same time few scriptures reveal the pathos of a humbler trust and of a loftier devotion more tenderly than these same imprecatory psalms. The

thirty-fifth is a notable example. There we find a soul suffering the deepest wrongs on account of his love for righteousness. He is the victim of cruelty, ingratitude and injustice because he has been compassionate and kind. Or take the one hundred and ninth, the severest of them all; it is the cry of conscious integrity for vindication and justice. The same spirit comes out in Elijah's prayer on Carmel; we hear it in the warnings and appeals of John the Baptist; it was the motive power in the life of our Lord as He wrought His deeds of mercy and delivered His compassionate appeals to the Galileans and then at last was forced to pronounce upon their cities greater curses than fell upon Sodom and Gomorrah. At one time we hear the Teacher of Nazareth calling all that labor and are heavy laden to come unto Him that they may find rest unto their souls, and at another time we hear Him turning upon those who had refused Him with the malediction, "*Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation (the judgment) of hell?*" In these imprecatory psalms we have expression through personal experience of the same principles of mercy and justice that had been operative of God towards the wicked in the ages past, that were re-enforced in the warnings and appeals of the Lord Jesus and which relate the human soul to God as the Sovereign of Law and Love.

Besides what has been considered there are doubtless other scriptures that suggest difficulties to many devout souls. Almost any one finds a difficulty at some point. As we confront them let us remember that the same Spirit gave us the Old Testament as the New. Their messages may be different in character and form of utterance, but in all cases their end is the same, that of deliverance from moral evil and the redemption of the soul from sin. The great lesson of the Old Testament is that of the LAW, the great lesson of the New Testament is that of LOVE; each enforces the other. Divine mercy is in the Old Testament

but it is veiled under types and symbols, and Divine judgment is in the New Testament but it is tempered by the compassion of the cross. Both these great lessons are necessary for the redemption of our race. Until man has learned that the wages of sin is death he is not prepared to learn that the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ. We need the Old Testament to prepare us for the New; we need the New to interpret the Old. Sinai comes before Calvary and modern preaching needs to bring to the fore the fact of God's judgment against sin and that man the sinner is the only subject of salvation. Whether we read the stories of the flood or of Sodom and Gomorrah or of the slaughter of the Canaanites, or turn to the woes which Jesus pronounced upon the Pharisees or upon the Galilean cities the principle at the heart of the message is the same, that the wicked must perish and that the ways of God shall be accomplished. The mercy that called sinners to repentance in the New Testament, that was patient and longsuffering with the unbelief of the Galilean cities, that wept over Jerusalem, was the same mercy that warned against disobedience in Eden, that spared the antediluvians to listen to the preaching of Noah, that permitted righteous Lot to dwell in Sodom and which gave the Canaanites five hundred years to turn from their wicked ways.

Divine wrath and divine mercy are blent throughout all the scriptures. We find it so in the story of Eden and in the visions of Patmos, at Sinai and Calvary, on the lips of Elijah and in the messages of Jesus,—a revelation from God of the consequences of sin and the way of redemption contrived in an infinite wisdom and compassion for sinners. It is a common experience of all true believers that all moral difficulties dissolve and disappear for every soul that humbly and trustfully accepts Jesus Christ as Lord and King and the revealed word of God as the way of life. *He that willeth to do His will shall know of the teaching.*

BOOK REVIEWS

I. THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

Great Ideas in Religion. By J. G. Simpson. George H. Doran Co., New York, 1912. 315 pp. \$1.50 net.

Some of the great ideas of religion dealt with in the volume before us are the following: Experience, Creation, Sin, Grace, The Christ of History, The Real Presence, Christ and Society, Christ and Marriage. The volume is made up of essays and sermons. These seek to restate Christian truth in the light of contemporary thought. The author's Christianity is of the dynamic kind. He regards Christian experience as the starting point for any adequate understanding of the Gospel.

For him also the cross is central in the meaning of the Gospel and the revelation of the Bible. God is a redeeming God. In Christ he met conditions imposed by the presence of sin in the world and man's sore need of a deliverer from its power. All religions hold that God and man somehow are reconciled and that God really comes into human life. But apart from Christianity religion is man's effort to bridge the chasm which separates him from God. In Christ God builds the bridge over to man from the divine side. The Gospel is God seeking and finding man in his lost estate. Creeds are the human effort to interpret experience. We never understand fully the meaning of the great facts of the spiritual life but we are justified in attempting to explain them.

The Gospel is social in its implications. Society needs the righteousness and love revealed in Christ as the cure for its ills.

At many points the volume is stimulating and suggestive. The essay on the Historical Christ is one of the best in the series, in that it shows us how God is mediated to us only through the Jesus of the Gospels. In the main the author is strongly evangelical in his views of New Testament Christianity. He is

not in sympathy with the "reduced Gospel" which leaves out the characteristic Christian teaching. Sometimes one is impressed that the author is struggling between an evangelical and a sacramentarian interpretation, as in his essay on the Real Presence. But as previously remarked he is in the main spiritual and illuminating in his statements of Christian truth. It is a strong and edifying series of studies.

E. Y. MULLINS.

Basic Ideas in Religion, or Apologetic Theism. By Richard W. Micou. Edited by Paul Micou. Association Press, New York, 1916. 496 pp.

Professor Micou suggests his fundamental point of view in the following statement in the Preface: "The writer trusts his own position will be made plain, that Christianity is essentially the response of the spirit in faith and self-surrender to the revelation of God in Christ, and not the conclusion of any process of intellectual analysis and reasoning, though such work of the intellect is indispensable to the religious leader who would sympathize with the sad questionings of honest doubt and meet the assault of philosophical and scientific unbelief."

The aim of the author is to state the fundamental grounds of the Christian belief in God and immortality. There is no attempt to cover fully the ground of Christian evidences. The problems connected with the New Testament revelation of God in Christ are not formally discussed. There is however a very thorough presentation of the main arguments for the belief in God. The author reviews opposing theories and denials. He discusses many phases of modern scientific and philosophic theory, exhibiting an easy mastery of the material. Part I deals with the idea of God. He devotes considerable space to the various forms of the older arguments for God's existence and gives an illuminating section to Organic Evolution in relation to Theism. The writer has evidently been a very careful and thorough student of evolution. This is evident in the multitude of details which he sets forth in his main argument and in the footnotes.

Part II deals with the Spiritual Idea of Man. He devotes an interesting chapter to the universal belief in immortality, another to the philosophic analysis of the sources of the belief; another to the witness of conscience, and yet another to the witness of the heart as seen in the facts. In the chapter on the witness of the heart a great many quotations are given from many of the great poets. Indeed this entire chapter is one of the best in the book and makes a powerful appeal to the consciousness of believer and unbeliever alike.

The latter part of the volume is made up of notes which discuss a great number of related topics. Among these are a criticism of Darwinism; Instinct; The Ontological Argument Analyzed; Christian Science; The *a priori* Argument for Miracles; Brain and Personality, etc. A copious Index follows at the end.

Dr. Micou was a clear thinker, a scholar of wide attainments, and a forcible writer. The volume before us covers as completely and as satisfactorily as any recent volume the main topics discussed. It is true that in our day the emphasis has gradually been transferred from the purely intellectual to the more experiential side of apologetics. But it will always remain necessary to restate the fundamental grounds of Christian belief from the point of view of scientific and philosophic unbelief. Volumes of this kind therefore have a permanent place in our apologetic literature. No doubt this work of Professor Micou will prove an exceedingly useful guide to many who seek light on the greatest of all themes of human thought.

E. Y. MULLINS.

What Jesus Christ Thought of Himself. By A. P. Stokes. New York. Macmillan Co., 1916. 114 pp.

An effort is here made to ascertain by a study of the consciousness of Jesus what Jesus thought regarding Himself. The book is an exception to a multitude of books on the same general theme in one important particular. It permits the Gospels to tell their own story, to bear their own witness. The author is sympathetic with modern critical methods. He exhibits nothing of the "hide

bound" spirit in his claims for the records. But he does let the Gospels speak. One grows weary with the interminable stream of books professing to deal with the Gospels which in effect completely set them aside. We have been surfeited with a pseudo-criticism which refuses to accept the legitimate results of scientific criticism, and reconstructs the Gospel story out of purely subjective or mythical material.

The author of this volume has gathered in a systematic and clear and scientific manner the abundant material from the Gospels showing the unique character and place of Jesus in man's religious life. He finds all the old commonplaces of the evangelical faith as to his person so far as these may be gathered from the Gospels. He was truly human and limited. He was conscious of being the Messiah of the Old Testament prophecy. He was conscious of sinlessness, of absolute leadership, of being founder of a kingdom. He had power to forgive sins. He wrought miracles. He foreknew his own resurrection. He was conscious of an unique Sonship. He was conscious of power to forgive sins and of exercising power of judgment over men, and of returning after death to influence the world. He was in a true sense God manifest in the flesh. The author is doubtful as to the Virgin birth, and does not accept the older Trinitarian formula. Jesus is not to be called God absolutely nor is He merely the Prophet of God. He is the highest manifestation of God through a human life and shows the kinship between God and man. The latter general views are the inferences of the author from the data supplied by the Gospels, rather than direct teachings. Many will question whether in the end it is possible to load Jesus with the enormous burdens here imposed and yet withhold from Him the attribute of true deity. In the end water seeks its level. It may be possible temporarily to conceive Jesus as acting in ways possible only to God while remaining somewhat below God in essential dignity and power. There is however a spiritual logic which cannot easily rest content in this view. It is a hopeful sign, however, to find studies of this type coming from presses so long glutted with books of another sort. The main interest of Christianity is to adhere to the facts

of history and of experience. The doctrinal conclusions will usually turn out to be correct in the end if this is done. We commend this book as a concise, clear, and suggestive summary of the material supplied by the Gospels for interpreting the consciousness of Jesus.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect. By John Elliott Wishart. Bibliotheca Sacra Company, Oberlin, Ohio, 1916. 170 pp. \$1.00 postpaid.

Books on the intermediate state are few and in many instances unsatisfactory. In fact our information on the subject is meagre at best and it is not easy to arrive at conclusions which will satisfy everybody. Professor Wishart of Xenia Theological Seminary gives us in these 170 pages an interesting discussion of the theme.

The author holds that at death the soul does not cease to be conscious, and cites many Old and New Testament proofs.

He repudiates the soul-sleeping theory which holds that at death the spirit sinks into unconsciousness and remains so until the resurrection. He cites New Testament passages in disproof of the view and argues that it would be virtual annihilation of the soul for a time.

The passage in 2 Cor. 5:1-4 in which Paul refers to "our habitation which is from heaven" is taken to mean an etherial body of some kind, an attenuated form of corporeal clothing for the spirit. The author thinks this interpretation removes one of the chief difficulties connected with the intermediate state.

The author holds that character is crystallized in the experience of death. He presents the view that in all probability the crisis of dying involves a special turning point of the soul in which God's grace is offered under exceptionally favorable circumstances.

The final judgment is necessary as a public declaration of what was already established in the moral order.

The author devotes a chapter to the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory and shows very conclusively how fragile is the foundation of the dogma in Biblical teaching.

In the future life the author believes there will be activity and endless progress. The volume discusses briefly most of the problems connected with the intermediate state and will be found suggestive and helpful to all earnest students of the subject.

E. Y. MULLINS.

From Doubt to Faith. By Horace G. Hutchinson. Longmans, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London; Fourth Avenue and 30th Street, New York, 1915. Cloth, 64 pp. Price 6d.

This booklet is the product of the personal experience of one who has passed from agnosticism to faith. It should prove of real service to many others who are troubled by doubts that naturally spring from current philosophical theories and scientific hypotheses. The idea that started the movement toward faith was, that, assuming man's evolution to the state of moral personality, it would not be unlikely that, if he should stray and violate the moral imperatives, the Author of his being—call Him God—should, in some suitable way, seek to bring him back. And no more reasonable method could be than the incarnation of the Divine.

J. H. FARMER.

The Natural Order of Spirit. A Psychic Study and Experience. By Lucien C. Graves. Boston, Sherman, French & Co., 1915. 365 pp. \$1.50 net.

One is at a loss to know what to say about this and similar books. Theoretically it is possible, of course, that the ether, which is supposed to be a most refined kind of matter and to fill the universe, may be the abode of departed personalities. It may be also granted that possibly there have been cases, as is here claimed, in which persons living have received some sort of communications from departed spirits. But who knows anything about it?

As to the ether conditioning the existence of departed spirits, it is simply an interesting speculation. As to communications from departed spirits, there is no convincing evidence; and many alleged cases of such communication have been found to be fraudulent. So there we are. We simply do not know, and this book does nothing to relieve our ignorance.

The Gift of Mind to Spirit. By John Kulamer. Boston, Sherman, French & Co., 1916. 227 pp. \$1.35 net.

One looks into this book wondering what is meant by the title; but he never finds out. Evidently it is a book in which a layman in religion and philosophy who has read some modern scientific and philosophical literature undertakes to solve the problems of the universe. Quite a number of books of this type are appearing now. Of course, there are some good things in it; but crudeness is evident on every page. In his "confidential" address "to the reader," the author says: "As I said before, the volume contains my personal views, during the formation of which I purposely refrained from reading books treating the same subjects." Enough said.

The Law of the New Kingdom. By E. A. Abbott. The Cambridge University Press and G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1916. 569 pp. \$3.75 net.

Dr. Abbott continues his amazingly minute and scholarly researches in the Gospels (*Diatessarica*). This volume is Part X section IV. Dr. Abbott is not content till he studies the sources as far as possible with all the real helps available. He keeps his balance wonderfully well in the great mass of detail, though this review cannot follow him in all points. Sometimes he seems whimsical and to lose the true perspective. But he has run a sub-soil plough through the Gospels and Latin scholars will profit by his work.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

II. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Inventors and Money-Makers. By F. W. Taussig, Ph.D., LL.B., Litt. D., Henry Lee Professor of Economics in Harvard University. New York, The Macmillan Co. 135 pp. \$1.00.

The volume is composed of "lectures on some relations between Economics and Psychology delivered at Brown University in connection with the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the foundation of the University."

The application of Psychology to the study of the economic life is a notable aspect of present-day thought. This volume is a suggestive essay in this line of thought. Professor Taussig follows a trend which is quite pronounced now among psychologists to emphasize the important role which the instincts play in the activities of men. He uses the term in the broader, less definite sense, which includes all inherited tendencies or "dispositions." In fact it is the inherited tendencies or dispositions which he discusses rather than the "instincts," in the narrower and more definite sense of the term; and in my opinion it would have been better if he had all the way through used these terms rather than instinct. But this small matter of terminology apart, the discussion is singularly clear, full of interest and unusually suggestive. The "instincts" which he discusses in their significance for the economic life are those of contrivance, of acquisition, of domination, of emulation and of sympathy, or devotion.

In considering the last the author faces the question which must confront every one who thinks at all deeply on the motives of economic activity—would it be possible in another organization of society to give free and full play in economic life to all the first four instincts in complete correlation with the last?

In other words, would it be possible to organize all economic activity on the principle of service to humanity without weakening the propelling power of the motions which spring from the first four instincts? I think the author might have answered this question with a more positive and unqualified affirmative. However that may be, he has given us a very helpful discussion of a phase of economic life which is of the first importance in social ethics.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Executive and His Control of Men. A Study in Personal Efficiency. By Enoch Burton Gowin, Assistant Professor of Commerce, School of Commerce, Accounts and Finance, New York University. New York, 1915, The Macmillan Co. 349 pp. \$1.50 net.

The aim of the book is to point the way for an increase of executive ability; and there can be no question that it contains many valuable suggestions to that end. After stating the general nature of executive ability, the author takes up in Part I the study of the executive as an individual. The executive must be a man of overflowing *energy*, but an energy that is controlled, directed, economized. Part II is devoted to the consideration of the executive motivating his organization. He must have the mysterious power which impresses and dominates others; he must stimulate men; he must know how to bring into play the great human motives—such as initiative, suggestion, emulation, illusion, loyalty, etc., etc. In Part III are discussed the limits upon the executive. He is limited by his employees, or those through whom he works, by the opposition he arouses, by his competitors, and so on.

The author bases all his discussions and suggestions on the accepted principles of modern psychology, and is thoroughly practical. Of course, the reading of such a book will not make an efficient executive; but if one has the necessary gifts, or capacities, the reading of this book can hardly fail to be of value in clarifying his ideas of the forces and processes involved in his executive function. And it is worth something for one who has little executive capacity to know something of the laws of executive efficiency.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Criminal Imbecile—An Analysis of Three Remarkable Murder Cases. By Henry Herbert Goddard, Director of Department of Research, Vineland Training School, New York. The Macmillan Co., 1915. 157 pp. \$1.50 net.

In the study of mental defectives Dr. Goddard is perhaps the foremost man in this country. In this little volume he makes a careful study of three murder cases, "the first in which the Bonet-Simon tests were admitted in evidence" by the court. The discussion of these cases is very illuminating. Of especial inter-

est is the chapter on Responsibility. Here the question which must be answered at last by the science of psychology is discussed by a great authority; and one can hardly read the history of the cases and then take issue with the author, without ignoring some of the most certain psychological facts and principles. Such studies are bound to result after a while in a most desirable change in our criminal procedure, which in large part is yet based upon unscientific as well as unchristian principles.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Conception of the Church. By Canon J. G. Simpson, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London; Fourth Avenue and 30th Street, New York, 1915. 74 pp. Paper, 36c net.

Canon Simpson is certainly one of the most vital leaders and thinkers among present-day Anglicans. He makes special acknowledgement of his debt to Gore, Headlam, Lightfoot and—what is specially significant—Principal Lindsay of Glasgow. The fact is the author reveals something of an approachment toward non-episcopal communions.

The church, he thinks, is not constitutional but organic. It is not due to any outward act or precept of Christ; it is rather the product of life. "That society emerges out of the redemptive work which God has wrought in the world, and which is consummated in Jesus Christ. The invisible spirit finds full and intelligible expression in the body which has been prepared for Him in the visible realm. Its aspect as an institution is only secondary. It is comparable to the natural growths of the physical universe rather than to the formal constructions of human forethought. The work of grace is a new creation."

So as to the sacraments. "Are we really to regard the Lord's injunction as the delivery of a precept, and not rather as the disclosure of a method, which would approve itself in spiritual experience? Otherwise, even though grace were attached to its performance, it would still have been the imposition of a new legality. This becomes plainer still in the case of the Eucharist. Save in the Pauline account of its celebration, there is no hint of a positive command. The apostles see the Master act, and their spiritual instinct guides them to the significance of His action.

The sacraments rather emerge out of the depths of the Saviour's work than lie on the surface of His teaching.

Touching the Ministry he says: "To say that the ministry as we have described it, is an essential part of the Christian inheritance ought not to imply a denial of the claim that, wherever there are baptized believers, there is the Church and there Christ is present." "The very fact that it was not imposed upon the churches as a legal technical institution, but was rather a growth, which shaped itself under apostolic recognition, makes it not less, but more, a work of the Spirit than it is possible for a mere institution to be."

Two further quotations touch the relation of the Church and the Sacraments: "Viewed from the side of the individual it is faith reaching its full development in baptism, made perfect in an impressive act, which brings union with the community of God. Viewed from the side of the eternal purpose there is one Spirit which realizes its creative action in one Body." "Christ at the Passover with His disciples. They interpreted, truly, we cannot doubt, the new rite in which they then participated, by the practice which made it the bond of fellowship, bringing together believers in the spiritual communion of the Body and the Blood."

It is difficult to see how Dr. Simpson can go so far in his disclaimer of any precept from Christ in view of the Commission. And there should be no difficulty in admitting the precept without sacrificing the idea of "a growth which shaped itself under apostolic recognition" by the working of the Spirit.

The booklet is well worth reading. It may help Anglicans to emerge from sacramentarianism. It would be a tonic and a help to many Baptists who are disposed to treat the ordinances and the Church too loosely as if they were mere externals and not evidences of the wisdom of the Lord Jesus and vivid and helpful expressions of the Christian life.

J. H. FARMER.

A History of the Family As a Social and Educational Institution.
By Willystine Goodsell, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1915. 588 pp.

It is safe to say that this is the most important book on the family that has appeared since the publication of Howard's "*History of Matrimonial Institutions*." It occupies a place in the literature of the subject between Howard's great work and the epoch-making work of Westermarck. For the average reader it is, perhaps, preferable to either of them. The author traces the development of the family institution from primitive times down to the present era, and does it in a consecutive and orderly way. I doubt if there is any book which gives one so well the whole perspective of this development, though others may give a more exhaustive study of particular periods or phases of it. The volume seems to me, therefore, to fill a definite, important and hitherto unoccupied place in the literature.

The last two chapters are devoted to a discussion of "the present situation" and "correct theories of reform." It is evident that Prof. Goodsell leans toward what many consider somewhat radical ideas as to the woman question. But it does not seem to me that the unconcealed bias of the author's opinions is suffered to prevent the maintenance of a strictly scientific attitude in the statement and interpretation of facts.

Taken all in all, the book is, in my judgment, entitled to stand in the first rank of books on this important theme.

C. S. GARDNER.

Christianity and International Peace. By Charles Edward Jefferson, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1915. 287 pp.

This volume consists of six lectures delivered by Dr. Jefferson at Grinnell College last February. They are the product, therefore, of his thinking in the midst of the great war. The author is known for the lucidity of his style and the vigor and spirituality of his thought. In these lectures he is dealing with a congenial subject. No other writer with whom the reviewer is acquainted has exposed the fallacies and pretensions of militarism with more incisive phrase and merciless logic. He admits that the Church has not accomplished all it might, that the Bible may be interpreted so as to support war; but holds that in these forces lie the hope for the abolition of war. He calls for a propaganda

of peace in school and church and press and home. He holds that our national enemies and dangers are not external but internal, foes in our cities and bosoms. It is a book that will necessarily help the cause of peace. In particular preachers would obtain much helpful information and suggestion suitable for their pulpit ministrations. It ought to be widely circulated.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Sub Corona. Sermons Preached in the University Chapel of King's College, Aberdeen. By Principals and Professors of Theological Faculties in Scotland. Edited by Henry Cowan, D.D., D.Th., D.C.L., Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen, and James Hastings, D.D, Editor of "The Expository Times," etc. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915. 297 pp.

Here are twenty sermons of exceptional value. All of them are thoughtful; many of them are deeply spiritual, and they are written in excellent style. They are interesting also from another point of view. In the preface we are told: "Each preacher has spoken for himself and is responsible for his own doctrine only; still, when the sermons in this volume are taken together, some trustworthy knowledge will be obtained of the teaching which prevails at the present time in the Theological Colleges of Scotland." That being so, it is evident that a robust type of moderate or conservative liberalism prevails in Scotland.

Among the preachers are a number whose names are quite well known already in the circle of the readers of this Review—*e. g.*, George Adam Smith, Janus Denney, David S. Cairns, Hugh Ross Macintosh, James Stalker, etc. These names, and others of men in the same rank, are a guarantee that this volume of sermons is worthy of a place in any minister's library.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Meaning of Personal Life. By Newman Smyth. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 358 pp. \$2.00 net.

There is given us in this volume one of the strongest discussions of the philosophy of personality. The author is a convinced and enthusiastic believer in the reality of free moral personality.

He sees in personality the real meaning of, the key to, the cosmic process. From the humblest beginnings he traces the upward movement of life till it arrives at personality, and this he follows in its development, in its fulfillment in Jesus Christ, and on into its consummation in immortality.

Dr. Smyth is acquainted with the best scientific and philosophical literature bearing upon the different phases of his great theme; and makes a critical and discriminating use of it. The conclusion he reaches is, from the point of view of this reviewer, satisfactory for the most part. The world-view to which he thinks the facts lead is what he calls "personal realism." Human personality is real; nature is real; God is real. "Individual personality is both real and ideal, or, more truly it might be said, both realizing and idealizing. It is both created and creative. It inherits its world as already existing for it, and recreates it after its own ideas. It is both effect and cause; both the issue of the past and a maker of the future. It has come forth from the whole of reality that was before it; it continues to be as an individual variable in the midst of the constants of nature."

The book is good, healthful, stimulating reading in these days when what were once considered the very foundations are being attacked from various directions. While here and there exception might be taken to some of his assumptions, or to some of his processes of reasoning, or to some of his criticisms of different views, the book on the whole makes a happy impression. The author, fairly facing the serious issues raised by modern science and working in a truly scientific spirit, is a man of broad intellectual outlook who finds in the scientific work of our time confirmation of the fundamentals of religious faith.

C. S. GARDNER.

Quiet Talks with the Family. By Charles Edward Jefferson, Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church in New York. New York, 1916. Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 187 pp. \$1.00 net.

A subject more urgently important could not present itself in our day and one would not ask a more competent man than Dr. Jefferson to present it. "The Family in Modern Life," is

having a hard time of it. The forces of education and of religion tend very largely to ignore the family and there are many features of our social and economic life that tend to destroy not only the power and influence of the home but the home itself. Dr. Jefferson gives no elaborate discussion of these facts and factors. Elaborate discussion is not his way. But he points them out with delicate and firm touch and makes his appeal in the most convincing and persuasive way. Then follow talks to the various members of the family. There is indeed a 'quietness' in it all that summons to meditation, to prayer. The book cannot fail to throw a holy spell of gentle seriousness over the reader and to open up his life to the influences that bring purity and strength. The book will help to make the family what it ought to be—what it must be if our modern life is to be saved from rushing itself into suicide in the eager chase for pleasure, sensation, wealth and power.

W. O. CARVER.

Just for Fun. By Helen J. Currier. A Collection of Games and Entertainments for use in the Home and Church. Philadelphia, The Griffith and Rowland Press, 1916. 165 pp. 50c.

There are some new ideas and some old ones in this handy little volume and it will be valuable on many occasions. It is very well done and there are times when all of us want just this sort of thing.

III COMPARATIVE RELIGION AND MISSIONS.

China—An Interpretation. By James W. Bashford, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Resident in China. New York and Cincinnati, 1916. The Abingdon Press. 620 pp. \$2.50 net.

Dr. Bashford writes with a free hand and deals with the assurance of a master with the essential phases of China's life and relations. The style is lucidity itself, and the work is presented in mechanical form that allures the reader. The author has not merely recorded for us personal observations and reflections on the one hand, nor on the other hand has he given us a compendium of the contents of good books and magazine articles. He

has combined the two methods of getting at his subject and then has handled it with personal independence. He has not taken things for granted. Giving discussions of the various topics that will be most interesting and illuminating for the intelligent reader, Dr. Bashford writes as one who knows, citing copiously the authorities for confirmation but always making the impression of independent agreement rather than dependent quoting. China, to be sure, is vastly too big for one man to know it in twelve years, or in a life time, and without any parade of the fact the reader is made to know when the author depends on first class authorities and when he writes out of his own experience.

The eighteen chapters treat of China's place in, and relation to, the world, of its inner life, industrial, commercial, educational, social and religious; of literature and philosophy; of law and politics; especially of the modern revolution in China and of the international and world phases of China's new era.

Japan's position in the East and in the world inevitably comes in for review and while the author thinks somewhat more kindly of Japan than the facts seem to me to justify, his diplomatic method of speech is to be commended and there is no compromise in the matter of Japan's haughty injustice and her disposition to take advantage of the European war to press her own selfish advantage.

There is no more comprehensive and helpful discussion of China in the literature. The book is most welcome. It is not that it is new so much as that it is confirmatory and gives a sort of total view that is very desirable at this time. One often will feel in reading it that one wishes to have many questions answered, but all along one will be getting the main outlines of the movement of the great Chinese people as they swing slowly into a new era in the history of the world, affecting at the same time the history of all the rest of the world.

W. O. CARVER.

Kingdom Preparedness—America's Opportunity to Serve the World. By Bruce Kinney, D.D., Author of "Mormonism." New York, 1916. Fleming H. Revell Company. 159 pp. 75c net,

Dr. Kinney has for many years been an energetic and thoughtful superintendent of home missionary work in the central western section of our country. This volume contains addresses which sum up the results of his study and reflection on God's plan and providence in the making of our country; on the tasks and responsibilities of the Christian forces here, and on the wider world-outlook of America's meaning. There are many references to recent and current events and the perspective of these does not always fully commend itself but the religious principle and application are true and pertinent.

The style is that of popular address with stories and phrasing that sometimes are better suited to that style than to the literary demand of a printed book.

But this earnest, thoughtful dealing with home problems of Christian duty is such as will interest and do much good in the reading of it. The several lectures are on "Providential Preparation for Our Task," "Who Is My Neighbor?", "Is Ours a Christian Nation?", "Home Missions and the Coming of the Kingdom," "Modern Problems in the Unfinished Task," "America's World Obligation."

For the average reader this is a noble volume well calculated to stimulate healthful religious reflection and action.

W. O. CARVER.

The Centennial History of the American Bible Society. By Henry Otis Dwight. New York, 1916. The Macmillan Company. 2 vols. 605 pp. \$2.00 per set.

At the end of a hundred years of blessing and service the American Bible Society, whose centennial was celebrated in May, tells its story through the facile pen of its able and devout secretary, Dr. Dwight. It is an inspiring story told with reverent awe and grateful thanksgiving. The society has helped to place God's word within the minds and hearts of people speaking one hundred and sixty-four different languages; has sent its colporteurs into many lands where they were pioneers and helpers; has given invaluable aid to missionaries and missionary societies; has helped to make the Bible the most popular book in all the world.

It has distributed forty-five million volumes of Bibles and Testaments through four continents outside America and sixty-five million in America. Its income in ninety-nine years has been \$38,016, 919.18.

An interdenominational organization making and distributing Bibles on an international field has had many problems and serious difficulties, sometimes sharp contentions. While the reverent note of worshipful praise dominates the writing of the history, the reader will find the stressful and stormy experiences treated with frankness and faithfulness. The society's course is justified by the author but he gives the essential facts so that the reader can reach his own conclusions. No great amount of space is taken up with the dissensions, as is most fitting, but the author has evidently purposed to give unbiased statements of fact. One example that will especially interest Baptist readers is the controversy over the Society's granting aid for a Bible in Bengali, translating βαπτίζεν. The grant was refused and the Baptist secretary, S. H. Cone, resigned and Baptists for many years had a society of their own, as is well known.

The society pursued the only course open to it if it would preserve its life. The story is simply and frankly presented here. A Baptist can hardly be blamed for looking askance at the deliberate decision of the Society, "to encourage only such versions as in the principle of their translation conform to the common English version." To make a version confessedly inaccurate in so many respects the standard in order to avoid translating a term which would teach the actual practice of Jesus and His apostles shows how far good and learned men will go to support or excuse a traditional practice. Baptists have always had so much advantage in this matter that their extreme contention and sometimes bitterness about it seem hardly warranted. To be able to say that *aspersionists* cannot and will not translate the original words of the New Testament has seemed to many including Francis Wayland quite advantage enough.

But let us not now magnify this point. The story is one of great and growing service which God has so manifestly blessed that we must all rejoice in it and in its story now so well told.

The difficulties of Bible distribution among slaves in the United States, the sad days of disaster in the Civil War, are other critical places in the story. Here too, we have faithfulness and justification with humble reverence.

Let me call attention to the price of the book—two splendid volumes and only two dollars.

W. O. CARVER.

Comparative Religion—Its Adjuncts and Allies. By Louis Henry Jordan, B.D., Member of the Institute Ethnographique International, Paris; Associate Editor of the Review of Theology and Philosophy; author of Comparative Religion; Its Genesis and Growth; 'The Study of Religion in the Italian Universities,' etc., etc. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London and New York, 1915. XXXII+574 pp. 12s. net.

Mr. Jordan has now for many years been giving himself to diligent study of Religion and has a passionate interest in the development of the Study of Comparative Religion to a point where it will "occupy a distinct field of its own quite separate from those other sciences with which it has frequently been confounded." Truth to say, he has a very restricted and by no means definite idea of the field and function of Comparative Religion. He would rigidly exclude from the science all contrasts between religion and limit it to similarities and correspondences. He rules out of the list of "comparativists" every man who finds any religion superior to others, as also all who undertake to draw from the study conclusions and inferences affecting the future of religion: "The legitimate scope of Comparative Religion is restricted to the past and present." Yet in the next paragraph after that from which this is quoted we find that part of "the real aim" of the science "is to investigate and expound the meaning and value of the several faiths of mankind." How that can be done without noting differences and drawing conclusions is certainly not obvious to the ordinary thinker.

It is just because our learned author is so hazy and inconsistent in his effort to narrow the subject to an impossible field that he has occasion to complain at all stages that few if any agree with him and that he is unable to find any books that conform to his idea of what books on this subject should be.

Up to this time Mr. Jordan's chief services to the study of Religion have consisted in stimulation of interest, in urgency of sharp and discriminating distinctions and, most of all, in reading hundreds of volumes and numberless articles in all departments of the study and reviewing them so that other students get the benefit of his omniverous reading. His reports of the contents of the works he reads are usually accurate, fair and scholarly. His estimates of them are not always acceptable to others, but one cannot find fault with his representation of them. The present volume is made up mainly of such reviews, so arranged as to give an account of the growth of scientific study in this great field.

Whether as the learned author proceeds with his ambitious scheme of publications on the subject he will be able to realize his ambition to get Comparative Religion on a new and better basis one does not feel so certain. But in any event his service is very great and there will be many gratefully to appreciate it. He is fortunate in his publishers, who give his work a fine dress.

W. O. CARVER.

Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M.A., D.D., and Louis H. Gray, M.A., D.D. Volume VIII. New York, 1916, Charles Scribner's Sons. \$7.00 per volume.

Beginning with "Life and Death" the more than 900 pp. of this volume carry an array of prominent names of writers on some of the most vital themes pertinent to this Encyclopædia. We have in these pages called attention to this noble work as the successive volumes appeared and are glad to do so again.

Among the major articles of the new volume are "Light and Darkness" treated from seven standpoints by as many authors; Literature with fourteen divisions; "Logos" is ably but not adequately treated by Prof. Inge; "Love" has thirty odd pages of sectional treatment; "Lutheranism" with summary presentation; "Lycanthrophy" with thirteen pages is probably overdone; "Madagascar" is treated only from the standpoint of the native religion and gets little more than two pages. "Magic" has elaborate treatment in seventy-seven

pages with fifteen writers. The Malay Archipelago and Peninsula have peculiar interest for religious study and are treated here with fullness. "Marriage" calls for fifty pages. "Mary" has an historical discussion of the "cult of the Virgin Mary." The treatment of "Matter" is brief. The article on "Messiah" is from the radical critical standpoint, even denying any Messianic reference in Isa. 53. "Methodism" is treated rather summarily but comprehensively.

"Missions," "Modernism," Monasticism," "Monotheism," and "Mohammedanism" appear. Biographical subjects of especial interest are Locke, Lotze, Luther, Maimonides, Martineau, Maurice, Mencius, Mill (James and John Stuart), Milton, Mohammad.

W. O. CARVER.

Forerunners and Final Rivals of Christianity. Studies in Religious History from 330 B. C. to 330 A. D. By F. Legge. Two volumes (202 pp., 425 pp.). 1915, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England; G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 25s. net.

These volumes are largely devoted to the presentation of the sources of our knowledge of the Essenes, the Gnostics, the Mithraists, the Manichæans. The author largely holds back his own opinions on points where there is much difference. But there is a great deal of valuable information here brought together in convenient and usable form. It is precisely in this region where there is sharp conflict of opinion today. Hence a useful service has been rendered by the volumes of Mr. Legge.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

IV. HISTORY, ECCLESIASTICAL AND GENERAL.

The Churches of the Federal Council. Their History, Organization and Distinctive Characteristics and a Statement of the Development of the Federal Council. Edited by Charles S. MacFarland, General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1916. 266 pp. \$1.00 net.

As the title indicates, this volume contains brief treatments of the various churches or denominations which compose the Federal Council of Churches in America. There are thirty of these to each of which a separate chapter is devoted. The closing chapter gives a brief survey of the origin, history, aims and constituents of the Federal Council. To each chapter is attached a brief bibliography of the best and latest books bearing on the subjects treated in the chapter. The volume, therefore, contains a treatment of the majority of the greater Christian bodies of the United States. But some large bodies are conspicuous by their absence, due to their unwillingness to take any part in the work of the Federated Council. One of the most notable of these is the Southern Baptists who have refused to have anything to do with the Federal Council.

Each of the chapters is written by a representative of the communion under discussion. Each has, therefore, a sympathetic and supposedly intelligent treatment. There is in each case a brief sketch of the history of the body, an exposition of its polity and ideals and its distinctive character, and finally an estimate of its peculiar contributions and achievements and its present numbers and equipment.

The writers in most cases are in no sense the official representatives of their churches appointed by church authorities, but have been selected by the Council or in some other non-ecclesiastical way. The book cannot be regarded, therefore, as in any sense authoritative except as the statement of fact is authoritative. Moreover the various chapters vary greatly in value. Some of them are of really great value; others are mediocre. One of the poorest is that on the Northern Baptists. Again the articles are by no means graded in length to match the importance of the bodies treated. For example, eight pages are given to Northern Baptists and the same number to Seventh Day Baptists; seven to the Methodist Episcopal Church and nine to the M. E. Church, South; five pages to the Southern Presbyterians, eight to the United Presbyterians and eleven to the Reformed Church in America.

Notwithstanding these defects, perhaps inevitable to the plan upon which the work was produced, it has very considerable merit. Some of the contributions are excellent—accurate and illuminating.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Irenaeus of Lugdunum—A Study of His Teaching. By F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, M.A., D.D., with a Foreword by H. B. Swete, D.D. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914. 367 pp. 9s. net.

This is a capital introduction to Irenaeus. There is a sketch of his life, a chapter about his teachers and an excellent compendium of his teachings. There are nineteen chapters all told. How inviting they are may be seen from some of the titles: "The Education of Man," "The Rule of Faith," "The Doctrine of the Trinity," "The Incarnation and the Atonement," "Biblical Views, Interpretation of Scripture, Etc.," "The Canon of the New Testament," "The Church," "The Ministry, Continuity and Orders," "The Sacraments of the Church," "Psychology, Salvation, Future Hope," "Gnosticism, Ancient and Modern," "Creed and Conclusion."

An ample index makes reference easy. It is interesting to see that this specialist on Irenæus does not always find Harnack's representation of his teachings correct. "Another cometh and searcheth him."

J. H. FARMER.

Menno Simons; His Life, Labors and Teachings. By John Horsch. Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa., 1916. 324 pp. \$1.25.

Menno Simons was an important character in the history of the Reformation. After the sad collapse of the German Anabaptist movement in the horrors of Munster it was he that saved its remnants and turned it back into sane and safe channels. The Anabaptists were centuries ahead of the masses of the Christians of their day in many respects—in the practical effort to realize the Christian ideal of a pure, regenerate church, the complete realization of Biblical Christianity and the absolute separation of church and state with consequent religious freedom and the

cessation of persecution. Many of the things for which they strove are now the possession of free America and a few other lands, but their highest ideals still wait on their fulfillment. But surely any man who wrought and suffered for these treasures of modern life when others regarded them as deadly dangerous deserves to be remembered.

On account of the fact that his followers have never been numerous as an organization he has not been well known. There has been no good "Life" of him in English or indeed in any language. Mr. Horsch has produced a good treatment of this hero of the struggle for freedom and righteousness. Baptists with Mennonites will share the joy of reading this work, because Baptists are the descendants in many respects of the Anabaptists. They will find in Menno's works a strong statement of some of their own most cherished doctrines.

The work is well done. Extensive extracts from the works of Menno are given in good translation, which makes it possible to judge from the sources of the teaching of Menno. These are arranged according to subjects treated so that one can quickly see from Menno's own words just what his teachings on the various subjects in dispute were. The main facts of his life are set forth with some fullness and in proper relations with the great events of the times in which the author lived. Altogether the book is a substantial and important addition to the literature, not only of the Mennonites as a Christian body, but to the broader question of religious freedom and the struggle for a pure church upon the earth.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Great Revival in the West, 1797-1805. By Catherine C. Cleveland. The University of Chicago Press, 1916. \$1.00 net.

The Revival considered in this book is that which reached its highest level in Kentucky at the end of the eighteenth century but was also influential in other states. It was one of the most remarkable religious movements which have appeared in the history of our country. It was notable in the physical effects which it wrought on many of those present, but also in the moral and cultural regeneration which it brought to many communities on

the frontier. It is, therefore, well worthy of study and has had several more or less extended treatments. The one under review is in some respects the most satisfactory that has appeared. It is based very largely on a fresh study of the original sources, is sympathetic but critical, and makes a sincere effort to estimate the effects, both good and bad. Those who have never looked into this wonderful revival will find the book fascinating, and those who are more or less familiar with it will find additional material and a good deal that is new. It is an important addition to the literature of the specific subject in hand and also of revivals in general.

The estimate of the effects which the author expresses is that on the whole the good largely predominated. The Presbyterian Church in which the movement originated was rent by two schisms as a result of the revival and greatly injured; the Baptists, who were little affected by the bodily contortions, and the Methodists received great benefits. Both bodies received large additions to the membership and were otherwise helped.

Several important documents bearing on the revival are reprinted in appendixes, and an admirable bibliography (which, however, has some remarkable omissions) completes a very interesting study of the great Revival.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Deutsche Theologen über den Krieg. Stimmen aus Scherer Zeit. Gessammelt u. herausgeben von Wilhelm Laible; 1915, Dorffling & Franke, Leipzig. 247 pp. m. 4.20.

This small volume is a very interesting one. The censorship of the German military authorities has been so complete that almost nothing indicating differences of opinion among the German people has escaped through to foreign lands. It is, therefore, of great interest to see how the theologians of Germany are viewing the war.

To begin with they are all intensely national and very optimistic. They want Germany to win and expect her to win. Further they think the war is a righteous one from the German standpoint and that it was forced upon them.

Beyond this there is wide difference of opinion and feeling. Some of them are so intensely national as to lose all elements of universalism and can see no more broadly than the narrowest military man: Germany is the chosen nation and the Almighty is practically a German national god. He is fighting their battles because he loves them and hates their enemies. Others see much more broadly and truly: Germany has faults to answer for, she is suffering for her sins like the others, the wild laudation of the nation and government in all the acts is most untrue and hurtful. They do not approve of the song of hate, realizing that such a spirit is unchristian and unhuman and must necessarily work woe to themselves.

Many of them discuss the moral and religious difficulties that have been raised by the fact of the war aside from all question as to the justice of this or that cause. Others deal with the kind of preaching which ought to be delivered to the people in such times, not infrequently pointing out the extreme danger of undue adulation of the German cause and the certain triumph of the German arms.

Altogether it is one of the most informing books that have appeared on the state of the German mind on its better side. It lets us see how the best Germans, some of them, are thinking about themselves and their problems. It is a moral relief to learn that they are conscious of any moral problem in connection with the war. They generally appear as wholly unconscious of anything else than the matchlessness of the Germans in every conceivable respect.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der bernischen Täufer; von Adolf Fluri
Bern, Druck u. Verlag von Gustav Grunau, 1912.

This booklet contains four brief, interesting and valuable contributions to the history of the Anabaptists in the canton of Bern in the seventeenth century. In the sixteenth century they were very active in this canton, and they have persisted down to the present time. During most of this long period they suffered severe persecution. These were particularly severe in the seven-

teenth century where there were evidences of a new prosperity and growth among the Anabaptists. Much of the contents of this little book consist of extracts from court and other cantonal records showing how they suffered about the middle of the seventeenth century. This is a story of heroic suffering and patient steadfastness, inspiring to all who love religious freedom. We are grateful to Dr. Fluri for bringing out in print these additional evidences of the steadfastness of our spiritual ancestors.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Memories of a Publisher, 1865-1915. By George Haven Putnam, Litt.D. Second Edition, 1916. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London. 494 pp. \$2.00 net.

This is an intensely interesting volume. Dr. Putnam has had a long and honorable career. He has come into touch with a very large number of the leading men of the last fifty years. He thinks clearly, commands a terse, vigorous style and has remarkable ability to read and portray character. The personal sketches of authors and the clear presentation of movements and policies make the book positively fascinating and uncommonly informing. An appendix of fifty pages on "The European War" adds greatly to its value. One could wish that that chapter were published by itself and scattered broadcast over the world. It is courageous, discriminating and just.

J. H. FARMER.

V. BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Isaiah, Chapters 1-XXXIX in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. J. Skinner, D.D. LXXXV--314 pp. 75 cts.

Joel and Amos. Edited by S. R. Driver, D.D., adapted to the text of the Revised Version, with a few supplementary notes by H. C. O. Louchester, M. A. 251 pp. 65 cts. To be had of G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

Dr. Driver's excellent commentary on Joel and Amos has been adapted to the text of the Canterbury Revision, and a few

supplementary notes have been added by Mr. Louchester. The work thus remains substantially as it appeared in 1897 from the pen of Professor Driver. The editor is to be commended for his modesty in introducing a minimum of changes in the commentary.

Students who possess a copy of Dr. Skinner's first edition of *Isaiah*, Chapter I-XXXIX, which appeared in 1896, will welcome the revised edition of 1915, for the new edition not only adapts the comments to the text of the *Canterbury Revision* of 1885, but incorporates much additional material. Moreover, the valuable Introduction has been almost entirely rewritten, and embodies the fruits of nearly twenty years' additional study of the roll of *Isaiah*. Since the publication of the first edition of Dr. Skinner's commentary in 1896, there have appeared new editions of Dillmann and Duhm and new commentaries by Marti, Whitehouse, Condamin and Gray. Other important works in Old Testament study have thrown light upon the prophecies of *Isaiah*. Dr. Skinner has made good use of the newer literature, and has brought his treatment up to date. His discussion of the theological ideas of *Isaiah* have been recognized as masterly, and now he gives more careful attention to the historical situation and political developments of *Isaiah's* times. Dr. Skinner's volume is an excellent aid to the busy student who wishes a sane treatment in moderate compass by a reverent critical scholar.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

A Pocket Lexicon to the New Testament. By Alexander Souter, M.A. Sometime Yates Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in Mansfield College. Oxford, 1916, Clarendon Press. 290 pp. 3s. net; India paper, 5s. net.

This is a splendid little lexicon with many admirable qualities. The author says that in seeking "to give the forms of Greek words in the New Testament and their meanings as exactly as possible, according to the best knowledge available at the present time" he has "studied unity throughout, omitting matters connected with declension, conjugation, gender, etc., and

even references to passages in the New Testament itself, except in cases where the reader might be left in doubt which of two or more senses to choose."

Words and ideas borrowed from other languages and their source are indicated. It is a great pity the roots of Greek words are not given.

The English equivalents of verbs are given in first person to correspond with the Greek. The infinitives of both languages would be better but this is an improvement over most lexicons.

New Testament references could have been given for almost all words without adding ten pages to the book and would be a decided help. For the most part the English equivalents are splendidly chosen. Sometimes the author has been unduly influenced by etymology or by classical usage.

διακονία does not mean "waiting at table," nor the verb "to wait at table." To define *ἁμαρτήμα* and *ἁμαρτία* both as "*a sin*" is a curious oversight. *νόμος* is inadequately defined. The handling of *βαπτίζεν* would be amusing if it were not an unfaithful handling of a sacred matter. What sense is there to "dipping (whether immersion or affusion)"? What sort of thing is "affusion dipping"? If Christian men will substitute another ordinance for baptism why not say so frankly and not seek to deceive themselves by such contradictions as 'dipping by affusion'?

The handling of *ἐκκλησία* shows a remarkable lack of thoroughness. The definition of *Χριστός* is extended but by no means sets forth the facts.

The work at many points confirms the intimations of the preface that it was hurriedly done. It represents fine scholarship inadequately applied. It is the best New Testament word-book available.

W. O. CARVER.

The Epistle to the Ephesians. Edited by Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge. With Notes and Introduction. Cambridge University Press, 1914. CIII--151 pp. 3s. 6d. net.

This is a volume of The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.

The author began lecturing on this Epistle a quarter of a century ago. He had access then to the notes taken by a college friend of unpublished lectures by Lightfoot. He acknowledges special indebtedness also to Hort and J. A. Robinson. "When nearly two years ago," he says, "I undertook this edition I set to work to go over the whole ground for myself afresh, doing my best to look at each thought in the whole context both of St. Paul's writings and of the old and New Testaments. A long apprenticeship to Dr. Hort had taught me the value of this method of arriving at the meaning of pregnant words and phrases of the Apostle. The notes in this edition are for the most part the result of this independent study. Checked from time to time, after I had arrived for myself at a provisional conclusion, by reference to previous commentators."

It is an independent and thorough piece of work, worthy of Cambridge's best days. The notes give evidence of rare insight and sound judgment. They are clear, concise, illuminating. An example is seen in the very difficult sentence (in 5:13) which he translates: ("In fact everything that is made manifest is light.") The note runs: "What St. Paul says is obviously true in the physical sphere. Everything substantial will bear the light, and becomes visible by reflecting it. His argument asserts that it is true also in the spiritual sphere. Here also whatever will bear the light becomes itself a source of light. The logical connection may be variously interpreted. The clause explains the fruitfulness of the light in itself and in every heart in which it finds a home. This whole passage should be carefully compared with Jno. 3:20-f." In 2:21, he sets aside the translations "all the building" and "every building" and gives "each course in the building." In 2:7 *Χρηστότητι* is "grace" or "mercy" in action. In 2:8, "and that not of yourselves it is the gift of God" "is best taken as parenthetical. Even the faith which is the one element which we contribute to the total result is not self originated. It is the gift of God. He inspires us with love by loving us, and with faith by believing in us and showing Himself absolutely worthy of confidence."

The Introduction, which covers ninety-two pages, is probably the best in existence. The superficial character of Moffatt's ar-

guments are courteously but completely exposed. The author furnishes another illustration of the superiority of the English mind to the German in weighing evidence and of the necessity on the part of young English scholars of guarding against being influenced by the German tendency to allow theories to override facts. Many matters of great interest and importance are dealt with in the Introduction and the additional notes. I shall mention only two or three.

Dr. Murray throws fresh light on I Peter which he believes to be later than, and indebted to, Ephesians—against Bigg in the I. C. C. So Paul's influence in Asia Minor was greater, he thinks, than Dr. Swete (*Apocalypse*) admits. His investigation of the textual phenomena confirms Hort's estimate of *8 B*. These MSS. seem to have a very early common original, not the autograph.

Care, competency in scholarship and judgment, and candor mark this very valuable work throughout.

J. H. FARMER.

The First Epistle of Peter. Edited by Rev. G. W. Blenkin, M.A. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914. LXXXVIII+132 pp. 3s. 6d. net.

This also is one of the Cambridge series of the Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. The author's chief indebtedness is to Hort, Bigg and Chase. Both introduction and commentary are well done. He agrees with Murray against Bigg in recognizing dependence of I Peter on Ephesians. The date he puts between 62 and 64 A. D. He has the best of the argument against Ramsay touching date and the historical situation implied. The notes show good judgment. Grammatical points would have been improved had the author studied Robertson's Grammar.

J. H. FARMER.

International and Critical Commentary on the Epistle of James. By James Hardy Roper, D.D., Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard University. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York City, 1916. 319 pp.

There are now two sets of New Testament Commentaries in English on the Greek Text that compete for supremacy, the International Critical (Scribner's), and the Macmillan Commentaries. Now one is ahead and now the other. Prof Roper had to go up against Mayor on James and it may be said at once that he has not come up to the level of Mayor, whose exhaustive and masterful work has now appeared in a second edition. But Roper has done a splendid piece of work. It is concise, clear, and modern. The Jacobean authorship is denied against Mayor and pseudonymity is held as probable and the date at the end of the first century. But Roper is not convincing here. He is probably right (p. 162) in reading ἡ τροπῆς ἀποσκιάσματος after ⚭ B in 1:17 "the variation that is observed in the turning of the shadow." One is glad to add this sharp tool to his worship.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Historical Bible. The Work and Teachings of the Apostles. By C. H. Kent, Ph.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1916. 313 pp. \$1.25 net.

Prof. Kent has produced, in harmony with the other volumes of the series, a popular interpretation of the Apostolic period from the liberal standpoint. He has a selected bibliography for various aspects of the study. He appends the Epistle of James as a pseudonymous book after the Apocalypse of John which is also pseudonymous.

The Twelve Apostolic Types of Christian Men. By Edward A. George. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York City, 1916. 235 pp. \$1.00 net.

Helpful studies, though not strikingly original, are these chapters. The style is simple and clear and the treatment straightforward and practical. They will help the average reader to visualize the Twelve Apostles.

INDEX

BOOKS REVIEWED

Abbott, E. A.: The Law of the New Kingdom.....	403
Bashford, James W.: China—An Interpretation.....	411
Blenkin, Rev. G. W., M.A.: The First Epistle of Peter.....	427
Cleveland, Catherine C.: The Great Revival in the West, 1797-1805.....	420
Cowan, Henry, D.D., D.Th., D.C.L.: Sub Corona.....	409
Currier, Helen J.: Just for Fun.....	411
Driver, S. R., D.D.: Joel and Amos.....	423
Dwight, Henry Otis: The Centennial History of the American Bible Society	413
Fluri, von Adolf: Beiträge zur Geshichte der bernischen Täufer.....	422
George, Edward A.: The Twelve Apostolic Types of Christian Men.....	428
Goddard, Henry Herbert: The Criminal Imbecile—An Analysis of Three Remarkable Murder Cases.....	405
Goodsell, Willystine: A History of the Family As a Social and Educational Institution	407
Gowin, Enoch Burton: The Executive and His Control of Men. A Study in Personal Efficiency.....	405
Graves, Lucien C.: The Natural Order of Spirit. A Psychic Study and Experience	402
Hastings, James, D.D.: Sub Corona	409
Hastings, James: Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.....	416
Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery, M.A., D.D.: Irenaeus of Lugdunum.....	419
Horsch, John: Menno Simons; His Life, Labors and Teachings....	419
Hutchinson, Horace G.: From Doubt to Faith.....	402
Jefferson, Charles Edward: Christianity and International Peace.....	408
Jefferson, Charles Edward: Quiet Talks with the Family.....	410
Jordan, Louis Henry, B.D.: Comparative Religion—Its Adjuncts and Allies	415
Kent, C. H., Ph.D.: The Historical Bible. The Work of the Apostles	428
Kinney, Bruce, D.D.: Kingdom Preparedness—America's Opportunity to Serve the World.....	412
Kulamer, John: The Gift of Mind to Spirit.....	403
Laible, von Wilhelm: Deutsche Theologen uber den Krieg.....	421
Legge, F.: Forerunners and Final Rivals of Christianity.....	417
MacFarland, Charles S.: The Churches of the Federal Council.....	417
Micou, Richard W.: Basic Ideas in Religion, or Apologetic Theism.....	398
Murray, Rev. J. O. F., D.D.: The Epistle to the Ephesians.....	425
Putnam, George Haven: Memories of a Publisher, 1865-1915.....	423
Roper, James Hardy, D.D.: International and Critical Commentary of the Epistle of James	427
Simpson, J. G.: Great Ideas in Religion.....	397
Simpson, Canon J. G., D.D.: The Conception of the Church.....	406
Skinner, Rev. J.: Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.....	423
Smyth, Newman: The Meaning of Personal Life.....	409
Souter, Alexander, M.A.: A Pocket Lexicon to the New Testament.....	424
Stokes, A. P.: What Jesus Christ Thought of Himself.....	399
Taussig, F. W., Ph.D., LL.B., Litt D.: Inventors and Money-Makers.....	404
Wishart, John Elliott: The Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect.....	401

BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY THE
SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD

SENT POSTPAID ON RECEIPT OF PRICE

- Baptist Hymn and Praise Book**—416 pp., 577 hymns. Price, single copy, postpaid, 60 cents; in quantities, 50 cents each. Transportation extra on quantity lots. Beautiful pulpit edition, in Morocco and gilt, \$1.50 postpaid. Music edition only with round notes. No word edition.
- Baptist Why and Why Not**—Twenty-five chapters by twenty-five writers. Comparative study of the creeds. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 430. Postpaid, 50 cents.
- The Story of Yates, the Missionary**—C. E. Taylor. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 300. Price 50 cents.
- The Moral Dignity of Baptism**—J. M. Frost. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 282. Price 75 cents.
- The Memorial Supper of Our Lord**—J. M. Frost. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 282. Price 75 cents.
- The Doctrines of Our Faith**—E. C. Dargan. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 234. Price 50 cents.
- Isaac Taylor Tichenor, the Home Mission Statesman**—J. S. Dill. 12mo., pp. 168. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 35 cents.
- Our Church Life**—Serving God on God's Plan—J. M. Frost. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 260. 75 cents.
- The Young Professor**—A Story of Bible Inspiration—E. B. Hatcher. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 503. Illustrated. Price 75 cents.
- An Experience of Grace**—Three Notable Cases, Saul of Tarsus, Edward Everett Hale, Jr., and John Jasper, the negro preacher—J. M. Frost. Pp. 108. Cloth, 40 cents; paper, 25 cents.
- Training in Church Membership**—I. J. Van Ness. Pp. 128. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 30 cents.
- The Heart of the Old Testament**—J. R. Sampey. Pp. 283. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 35 cents.
- Baptist Principles**—Letters of a Father to His Son—E. E. Folk. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 208. Price 50 cents.
- The Ethical Teaching of Jesus**—J. R. Sampey. Pp. 211; Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 25 cents.
- The Highway of Mission Thought**—Eight of the great discourses on Missions, edited by T. B. Ray. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 270. 75 cents.
- The New Convention Normal Manual**—Spilman, Leavell and Burroughs. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 35 cents.
- The New B. Y. P. U. Manual**—L. P. Leavell. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 150. 50 cts.
- Parliamentary Law**—F. H. Kerfoot. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 183. 75 cents.
- Spiritual Farming**—J. F. Love. Pp. 70. Leatherette, 50 cents.
- The Baptist Position and the Position for a Baptist**—J. F. Love. Pp. 121. Cloth, 25 cents; paper, 15 cents.
- The School of the Church**—Its Pre-eminent Place and Purpose. J. M. Frost, D.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 193. Price, \$1.00 postpaid.
- The International Lesson System**—The History of its Origin and Development. J. R. Sampey, D.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 370. \$1.25 postpaid.
- How Baptists Work Together**—Lansing Burrows, D.D. Leatherette, 12mo., 138 pages. 50 cents postpaid.
- The Baptist Message**—All the Gospel for All the World. Articles previously published. Cloth, pp. 210. 50 cents postpaid.
- The Pastor and the Sunday School**—W. E. Hatcher, D.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 180. Price 50 cents.
- Pastoral Leadership of Sunday School Forces**—Rev. A. F. Schauffler, D.D. Cloth, 16mo., pp. 176. Price 50 cents.
- The Twentieth Century Sunday School**—S. H. Greene, D.D., LL.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 151. Price 50 cents.
- The Pastor and Teacher Training**—Rev. A. H. McKinney. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 150. Price 50 cents.
- What Baptists Believe**—O. C. S. Wallace, D.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 208. Price, 50 cents.
- Winning to Christ**—P. E. Burroughs, D.D. 12mo., pp. 92. Price, cloth, 50 cents; paper, 35 cents.
- Doctrinal Outlines**—P. E. Burroughs, D.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 68. Price, 25 cents.
- The Convention System of Teacher Training**—P. E. Burroughs, D.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 112. Price, 25 cents.
- Convention Adult Bible Classes**—J. T. Watts. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 108. Price, 25 cents.
- Training in Baptist Spirit**—I. J. Van Ness, D.D. Pp. 176. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 35 cents.
- The Religious Development of the Child**—Rufus W. Weaver, D.D. Cloth, 12 mo. Price \$1.25.

Baptist Sunday School Board

J. M. FROST, Sec.
Nashville, Tenn.